School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1400638
BX
9075
A5
1899

Church of Scotland

FIRST CHURCH CONGRESS

1899

OBJECT OF THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

To bring together Members of the Church of Scotland for free deliberation, and for the exchange of opinion and experience on subjects which affect the practical efficiency of the Church and the means of her defence and extension; also for the encouragement of a general interest in these and kindred subjects among the clergy and laity in different parts of the country.

BX
9075
A5
1899

Church of Scotland

FIRST CHURCH CONGRESS

1899

HELD BY ORDER OF
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

GLASGOW, OCTOBER 25TH TO 27TH 1899

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Edinburgh
J. GARDNER HITT, 37 GEORGE STREET
GLASGOW: JOHN SMITH & SON, 19 RENFIELD STREET
LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK, 62 PATERNOSTER ROW
1899

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

President of Congress.

The Right Reverend The MODERATOR.

Vice-Presidents.

The Very Rev. J. CHRYSTAL, D.D., LL.D.
,, ,, W. H. GRAY, D.D.
,, ,, P. J. GLOAG, D.D., LL.D.
,, ,, JAS. MACGREGOR, D.D.
,, ,, A. H. CHARTERIS, D.D., LL.D.
,, ,, J. MARSHALL LANG, D.D.
,, ,, R. H. STORY, D.D.
,, ,, DONALD MACLEOD, D.D.
,, ,, ARCH. SCOTT, D.D.
,, ,, WILLIAM MAIR, D.D.
,, ,, THOMAS LEISHMAN, D.D.
,, ,, ALEX. STEWART, D.D.
The Rev. the MODERATOR OF THE SYNOD OF GLASGOW AND AYR.
,, MODERATOR OF THE PRESBYTERY OF GLASGOW.
,, MODERATOR OF THE PRESBYTERY OF EDINBURGH.
The Rev. NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D., Junior Clerk of Assembly.

General Committee.

J. MARSHALL LANG, D.D. ; Principal STORY, D.D., *Conveners.*

Programme Sub-Committee.

The Rev. Professor COOPER, D.D., *Convener.*

Finance Sub-Committee.

F. W. ALLAN, Esq., P. GALBRAITH, Esq., *Conveners.*

Report Committee.

Rev. ARCH. FLEMING, *Convener.*

General Arrangements Committee.

C. M. SCOTT, Esq., *Convener.*

Reception Committee.

Rev. P. M'ADAM MUIR, D.D., *Convener.*

Hon. Secretary.

Rev. H. J. WOTHERSPOON.

Hon. Vice-Secretaries.

Rev. R. PRYDE. | Rev. J. B. A. WATT.

Hon. Treasurers.

J. A. WENLEY, Esq. | JOHN M. MACLEOD, Esq., C.A.

CONTENTS.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25.

PAGE

RECEPTION by The Hon. the LORD PROVOST and MAGISTRATES of GLASGOW in Municipal Buildings, ... 1

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26.

SERVICE IN GLASGOW CATHEDRAL.

SERMON by the RIGHT REVEREND THE MODERATOR, . . 4

GENERAL MEETING, ST ANDREW'S HALLS.

Chairman of Congress—The Right Rev. The MODERATOR.

ADDRESS by the Very Rev. Principal STORY, D.D., . . 12

FIRST MEETING FOR DISCUSSION.

Chairman—The Right Rev. The MODERATOR.

Subject—"THE CHURCH: (*a*) ITS VOCATION; (*b*) ITS RELATION TO MODERN THOUGHT."

(*a*) "Its Vocation."

Papers—(1) The Very Rev. Dr LEISHMAN. . . . 24
(2) Rev. Professor PATERSON, D.D., . . 30
Speakers — Rev. Professor HERKLESS, D.D., . . 37
Rev. J. RUDGE WILSON, M.A., . . 40
Discussion, ... 46

(*b*) "Its Relation to Modern Thought."

Papers—(1) The Very Rev. Principal STEWART, D.D. . 53
(2) J. H. MILLAR, Esq., Advocate, . . 61
Speakers — Rev. Professor PATRICK, D.D., . . 68
Professor CLELAND, M.D., . . . 71
Discussion, ... 72

EVENING.

PUBLIC MEETING.—Working men specially invited.

Subject—"THE CHURCH: ITS ATTITUDE TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC MOVEMENTS," 74

Chairman—The Hon. the LORD PROVOST OF GLASGOW.

Speakers—The Rev. Professor FLINT, D.D. . . . 77
Rev. JOHN GLASSE, D.D. . . . 92
Rev. J. M. ROBERTSON, M.A., St Ninians, . 104
Rev. A. WALLACE WILLIAMSON, M.A., Edinburgh, ... 110

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27.

PAGE

SECOND MEETING FOR DISCUSSION.

Chairman—The Right Rev. The Moderator.

Subject—"The Church: its Services and their Adaptation to the Necessities of the Present Day."

Papers—(1) The Very Rev. J. Marshall Lang, D.D.
"The Desiderata of Congregational Worship," 119

(2) The Rev. G. W. Sprott, D.D. "The Services of the Church considered historically and with reference to the needs of the present time," 124

Discussion, ... 128

THIRD MEETING FOR DISCUSSION.

Chairman—The Right Rev. The Moderator.

Subject—"The Church: Its Home Sphere of Work."

(*a*) "The Church: Its Obligation to its Parishes."

Papers—(1) Rev. Norman Macleod, D.D., 150

(2) Rev. Prof. Menzies, D.D.
"The Galilean Ministry of Jesus," . 157

Speakers — Rev. J. Elder Cumming, D.D., . . 161
Rev. Prof. Cowan, D.D., . . . 163

Discussion, ... 167

(*b*) "The Church: Its Obligation to the Young."

Religious Education—(*a*) In England, (*b*) On the Continent, as compared with Scotland. Religious Education, apart from the Elementary Schools, in—(*a*) Secondary Schools; (*b*) The Universities; (*c*) The Home; (*d*) The Church.

Papers—(1) Rev. J. H. Crawford, M.A., Abercorn.
"Religious Education of the Young in England and on the Continent," . . 170

(2) Rev. Prof. Robertson, D.D.
"The Use of the Old Testament in the Religious Education of the Young," . . 180

Speakers—Sir J. Neilson Cuthbertson, . . . 190
C. G. Macrae, Esq., W.S., . . . 193
Rev. J. Smith, B.D., Partick, . . . 193

Discussion, ... 197

RULES.

1. All Meetings of Congress, with the exception of any otherwise specially intimated, shall be open to the public.

2. All Meetings shall be opened with prayer and closed with benediction by the President.

3. Subjects of discussion shall be introduced by papers and prepared speeches, generally not more than two of each, limited in length at the discretion of the Programme Committee; and the time remaining at each diet shall be for free and open discussion by Members of Congress.

4. Speakers shall address the Chair only, confine themselves strictly to the subject under discussion, cease when time is called, and speak only once on each subject.

5. The Moderator for the year shall be President; he shall be sole judge of order, and shall enforce the rules. He shall ring his bell two minutes before the time of each speaker expires, and again when it expires—and this in every case.

6. No vote shall be taken on any subject discussed.

7. None but Members of the Church of Scotland shall address the Congress, unless by invitation of the Committee.

8. The time allowed to speakers, other than those selected to read papers or give prepared speeches, shall not exceed eight minutes.

9. In the event of more members of Congress desiring to take part in a discussion than time will permit to speak, they shall be called upon by the President in the order in which they may have previously given in their names to the Secretaries at the table.

RECEPTION

By the Lord Provost and Magistrates of Glasgow in the Municipal Buildings,

On Wednesday, October 25th, at 8 p.m.

Lord Provost Sir David Richmond said :—

Moderator, my Lords, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—On behalf of the Corporation of the City of Glasgow I have very great pleasure in offering to the members of the Church of Scotland Congress a most cordial welcome.

During the time that I have been Lord Provost it has frequently been my privilege on this platform, and elsewhere, to extend the welcome of the Corporation to representative bodies who have visited our city for a variety of purposes. And when I express the pleasure which it affords the Corporation to extend their hospitality to the Congress now, I feel that I am at the same time discharging a function which, to me as an individual, is in the highest degree pleasant.

As a member of the Church of Scotland I am well aware of the great amount of good work it has done and the success which has attended its labours in the cause of the Christian religion in this country, and, in my opinion, it well becomes the municipalities of Scotland not only to show their appreciation of that work as opportunity offers, but also to do everything they possibly can to encourage the hearts and strengthen the hands of those engaged in it.

If I might venture to express an opinion on the proceedings of so august a body as the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, I would say that they took a wise step when they resolved to hold such a Congress as that which is about to begin its meetings in Glasgow.

It was never more needful than at the present moment to direct attention, by such means, to the work of the Christian churches in general, and to that of the Church of Scotland in particular.

We live in an age of indifferentism and great ignorance of the most important matters which pertain to the highest interests of mankind, and if such meetings as those promoted by the General Assembly have the effect of extending the influence of the churches and bringing their claims more prominently before the people, they will serve a most important purpose.

It is a happy coincidence that this Congress meets here on the eve of the great evangelistic campaign which is being so enthusiastically taken up by all religious denominations in the city, and I feel certain that the meetings of the Congress will have the effect of materially assisting the campaign in its noble work.

I have had an opportunity of perusing the programme of the Congress, and I observe that the speakers include many of the most distinguished lay and clerical leaders of the ecclesiastical thought of the country, whose discussion of such important questions as "The Church: its vocation and its relation to modern thought," cannot fail to prove most valuable and helpful not only in the way of explaining the position which the churches occupy in the social fabric, but in elucidating the real relationship between them and the general body of the people.

I do not intend to attempt to enumerate here far less to discuss the various items on the programme.

I hope to have an opportunity to-morrow evening of taking part in one of the important diets of conference, when I may have something to say as to the subject which is then to engage attention, but, meantime, let me say that I feel that the Corporation are to-night reflecting the wishes of the citizens at large in thus recognising the meetings of the Congress.

We have in the past had the honour of showing in a

similar way our sense of the value of the work which all Christian organisations are doing in the amelioration of the condition of the people, and we are delighted on this occasion to have the opportunity of acknowledging the labours of the Mother Church, and extending the right hand of fellowship to the reverend brethren who preside over her councils.

The members of the Corporation have never been called in question by their constituents for offering the hospitality of the city to such organisations as the Church of Scotland Congress, and I hope the day is very far distant when the citizens will be so blind to their true interests as to enter a caveat on such a ground.

The Corporation have always recognised that in the social and economic side of their work they to a certain extent assist the churches. I need only mention such spheres of activity as the City Improvement Department, which has been the means of providing the labouring classes with dwelling-houses of a commodious and sanitary description. Through the instrumentality of that department the city has been cleared of many of the wretched and unwholesome habitations which formerly proved a menace to the health of the whole community, and in course of time we hope that Glasgow will be rid of all the objectionable "rookeries" which in other days were discreditable to our civic government.

It is a trite saying that "cleanliness is next to godliness," and in the matter of sanitation and health I think the Corporation may claim to work hand in hand with the churches and other beneficent agencies.

I do not intend to intrude myself further on this gathering, but would conclude by again repeating that it affords the Corporation the greatest pleasure to have the members of the Church of Scotland Congress in the City Chambers to-night.

SERMON

Preached in Glasgow Cathedral by the Right Reverend the Moderator.

On Thursday, October 26th.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation."—Proverbs xiv. 34.

The building in which we are here met will always be invested with a special interest to the Scottish nation. For thirteen hundred years the place in which it stands has been a centre of religious life. More than seven hundred years have passed since the foundation of this cathedral church was laid. Within its walls, two hundred and sixty-one years ago, in sorely troubled times, the form of government was restored which, since the Reformation, has been pre-eminently dear to the heart of the people of Scotland.

In no more fitting building could we meet for the opening service of a Congress of the National Church of this land. For here we are surrounded with the surging stream of modern life, and the memories are vividly recalled of a long and honourable past enriched by the faith and the work of those who occupied the places which we are now privileged to fill.

In selecting one outstanding truth to be an introduction and guide to our deliberations, I can think of none more appropriate than that suggested by the words which I have chosen as a text, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation."

There are many elements in the true ideal of national prosperity, each of which may form, in its own place, the legitimate object of a people's ambition. The accumulation of wealth is one; riches are a power and they are themselves the fruits of labour. But resources without the sense of responsibility, and the desire to use them freely and

wisely are not a blessing but the reverse. The well-known words are true to all time :

> "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> When wealth accumulates and men decay."

The development of industry may fitly stimulate the energies of a nation. Our own country, in these recent years, has enjoyed the benefits of almost unparalleled industrial activity, and for no part of it has the growth of trade and commerce done more than for the city and district around us. It has called forth an earnest intellectual and social power which has given fresh life to the energies and thoughts of the people of the land.

We can unfeignedly rejoice also in the striking increase of material comforts which have been distributed amongst all ranks and classes in the community. But, while grateful to God for these benefits, we should never forget that there must be other things besides the amenities of physical existence, if there is to be the highest and truest exaltation in a nation : "Man cannot live by bread alone."

The possession of adequate forces for national defence and attack is, with the help of God, a necessary safeguard for the prosperity and continuance of a nation. We believe that our country never had cause to feel this more deeply than now, and it was never animated by a more united and earnest desire to make its power sufficient to meet every danger, and to secure for its citizens the privileges of liberty, and justice, and peace.

Not one of these is to be depreciated. They are all, within due limits, legitimate objects of national effort and gratification. But the history of the great nations that have passed away or ceased to be controlling powers on the destinies of the world unite in telling us that if a land has not something besides and better than these, it will sooner or later dwindle and decay. In the last resort, it is "righteousness which exalteth a nation." A country's true strength lies in the character of its people. A nation's true work and true reward consist in its faithfulness to Him

who is the Author of its blessings and the Ruler of its destiny.

This brings us to the question what, in addition to the possessions which I have named, should stand out and signalize a land, if a first place in the rank of the nations is to be accorded to it? The answer I would give is—

1. Patriotism.
2. Integrity.
3. Interest in the well-being of humanity; and
4. Reverence for the name and truth of God.

Patriotism. It was characteristic of all whose names are most honoured in Old Testament Scripture that, next to the place which they gave in their hearts to God was their love for the land He had given them. Of Joshua, of David, of Elijah, of Nehemiah this is conspicuously true. If we are to be worthy of our country and do our part in advancing its welfare, we must loyally and faithfully love it. We have a land with a history of which we may well be proud. The distinction its sons have won, the place they have taken in every sphere of action and thought, the service they have rendered in the onward progress of the world should make all that concerns the name of their country dear to them. The Church does well when she puts before those who associate themselves with her that, as Christian patriots, they be interested in and rejoice in the honour of their land.

And further, a nation should place before it that, in its relations to every member of the State, unimpeachable justice shall be done. Neither fear nor favour should make it swerve from the stand it takes in this. In these past months there has been a striking lesson of the just discredit that comes to a land, when its supposed honour is its first consideration in the verdicts it awards and the deeds it does. From the Church of God a voice should ever go forth that, whatever may be the issue, there shall be integrity in public and in private life.

Interest in the well-being of humanity should have a special place in the counsels and the hearts of all who desire the true exaltation of a nation. The land and the individual that live only for themselves take a lower place in the scale of men and nations. The attitude of our country to all that concerns this has done not a little to make it what it is. It is not simply for national advantage and prestige that we multiply and extend our colonies and dependencies, but it is that, while doing so, we may be a blessing to the people and the realms over which it is our privilege to rule. The Church of Christ, as one of God's ordained instructors, should spare no effort to press and help forward this duty. In the execution of its commission it should give proof that no one can dispute that one of the pre-eminent purposes for which it holds its place in the institutions of the world is that it may elevate and purify all whom its influence can reach.

And yet one more element eminently contributes to the place and power of a nation, when it is associated with these and by such association elevates and purifies them. That element is reverence for the name and truth of God. The life of the world's great Example and the knowledge of the blessings which by His life and death He secured, the guidance provided by the standard of the divine word have, again and again, given life to nations and raised them to a place they would not otherwise have had.

In no land has the influence of this force and the other forces I have named been more conspicuous than in our own. It had an uncertain climate and a naturally unproductive soil. It was remote from the centres of civilisation and was inhabited by those of whom the world outside of it knew little, and for whom morally and spiritually, in their distant islands and inaccessible glens, nothing had been done. But God raised up men to do His work and gave them the qualifications they required for the service He assigned to them.

When we look back on the history of Scotland there are

three names that stand pre-eminently out as having helped to make our country what it is—St Columba, Robert Bruce and John Knox. St Columba, by his force of character, his fervent piety, his high conception of the mission of Christianity and his unwearied labours laid, with the help of God, the foundations of the Scottish Church, and left a name which has strengthened many a hand and given courage to many a heart to toil for the nation's good. Robert Bruce, by his single-minded passionate devotion to his country, by his securing its independence, kindled the fire of patriotism which, in the centuries that have since passed, has never again been quenched. John Knox, by his courage and the unwavering conviction of the righteousness of his cause, carried the battle of the Reformation, and left to his country the invaluable legacy of its pulpit and schools.

I will not attempt to follow the streams of the church and nation as the page of history records them. Both of them have had times of ebb and flow. The one has acted and reacted on the other. In regard to each of them, this truth stands signally out that influences, however excellent, and impulses, however strong, in the onward current of years, lose their force. They need, from time to time, to be revived and strengthened.

This was specially felt in the Church in the earlier years of this century, but two forces came to the rescue. The one was the work of making more adequate provision for the spiritual needs of the nation, and the other was the quickened consciousness of the obligation under which churches and nations are laid to share with others the blessings which God has given them. In recent years another great duty has been more vividly realized than in the past—the obligation that rests upon all who are enrolled in the membership of the Church to identify themselves with help rendered to humanity and to God. It is being more and more felt that a church is not merely an organization for providing privileges for those who are

connected with it, but that it is a centre from which there should go forth active and aggressive service to its country and to the world.

It is earnestly to be hoped, whatever questions may emerge in the future counsels of the Church, that the importance and the claims of each of these will receive the regard that is their due for they are the sheet anchor of its duty and its strength. But while we perpetuate and vitalize every thing that has come down to us that is good, we must also discern and provide for the new requirements that arise. Institutions cannot live in the memories and traditions of the past, however prized and precious they may be. Whatever in an age like ours stands still, dies. Whatever goes forward, leads on enterprizes for diffusing light, stirs hearts with nobler impulses and raises the moral and spiritual tone of the world, lives. And such, for the good of our country, we desire the character of our church to be.

The Congress which begins its meetings in this city to-day under the authority of the General Assembly, is one of those living and progressive movements. The influences which I have mentioned as having quickened the life of the Church in the course of the century have done, and we trust will long continue to do, most valuable work. Her stations have been increased throughout the country, and she has planted them nearer to the homes of those upon whom she seeks that her influence may tell. She has undertaken the mission of spreading the gospel throughout the world, and a spirit of co-operation and personal service has been awakened and she is assiduously striving that it be more and more awakened in the hearts of her members. It lies to her now to bring the united force of her devoted servants into closer contact with the life of the people and the problems which are engaging their minds. We have been made willing to share the burdens of the age and we believe we have the means of affecting its life powerfully for good.

There are many questions coming into prominence in our time which all who are interested in the service which

the Church can render should study and answer, with the best light which can be obtained. I will not state or in any way attempt to enter upon them. They are fully set forth in the papers which will be put into the hands of the members of the Congress. I feel assured that, with an open mind, and in no dogmatic spirit, they will be discussed, and that light, from whatever quarter it may come, will be welcomed as it deserves.

There is one matter which I am requested and desire specially to emphasize. It has been found, from the limits of time over which the Congress must extend, impossible to take up and do justice to several subjects of the first importance to a living Christian Church. The work of sending the truth of Christ to the heathen is one of these. It was regarded as better by those in charge of the arrangements to defer this till the next Congress shall be held, when full and adequate consideration should be given to it.

On the questions that will be discussed I know that there are those who regard with anxiety controversy upon subjects with which associations of deepest sacredness are bound up. But whatever may be the trials and difficulties that may emerge, we may rest confident in the conviction that if the Church of Christ is faithful to her trust, the issue will ever be that God will guard and preserve every thing that does honour to His Name, and has a power to be a blessing to the world.

It will help to remove unnecessary fears and to give us definiteness of purpose if we keep clearly before us that we meet as the servants of God. We are an assembly of the members of His Church. We acknowledge His presence in the life of the nation and we desire to see in it His will rule in the hearts of men. Our pre-eminent concern is with that "righteousness which exalteth a nation." We have no call to become judges between man and man in the political and economic and social relations of their lives. Our heart is set on their spiritual welfare. We seek to promote amongst them the cause of "pure and undefiled

religion," to cultivate a high and sacred conception of duty, and so to speak and act that justice and charity shall more and more in the world prosper and prevail.

And, further, we approach this task in the strength of a great faith. We are the witnesses of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ. We believe that there is salvation in Him for every nation and every individual. He has shown us the pattern of perfect holiness. He has revealed the truth which makes men free. He has established a kingdom in which all virtues may flourish and vice shall die. We know that the mercy of God in Christ can so change the heart of man that he may become an earnest follower after righteousness. We believe that if Christ's spirit of obedience and love and self-sacrifice, if it enter into and pervade the life of society it will raise up a better order, in which men will act as brethren, and share with one another the blessings of the one Father. We have a conviction, from which we will not swerve, that the deepening of a true faith in the ever living God, and in Jesus Christ our Saviour, the quickening of true and reverent worship, the increase of consecration in the practice of self-denial and mutual sympathy and helpfulness, are the essential means by which the life of a people is purified and exalted to its highest ends.

And with these convictions our appeal is made to every individual to make this cause his own. There is much to be hoped for from the united action of the Church and the nation. For ourselves, we are, we believe, warranted in looking forward to the widening of our knowledge and the quickening of our enthusiasm by such an inspiring gathering as this great Congress. But the root of all moral and spiritual progress must ever be in the individual life. A nation takes its character from the men and women who compose it. And, if the fruit of righteousness is to appear in our nation and is to lift high the horn of our true honour, it will come only through our being found faithful in our station to God in whom we believe, and to the Christ-like life to which we each of us are called.

OPENING ADDRESS OF CONGRESS

In St Andrew's Halls,

On Thursday, October 26th, at 1 p.m.

The Very Rev. Principal Story, D.D. — The function assigned to me by the Managing Committee of this Congress, is to extend a cordial welcome to the members before the serious business of the meetings begins. I have, to a certain extent, been anticipated in this agreeable duty by my hon. friend the Lord Provost and the Municipality of Glasgow, to whom we owe the brilliant and hospitable reception accorded to us last night in the marble halls of George Square. It was most proper and becoming that the Corporation of this great city should pay its tribute of interest and respect to any accredited body, representative of the life and thought of the Christian energy and enterprise of the National Church. The saint's shrine by the now dark and subterranean Molendinar—the same stream—"quantum mutatus ab illo"—as that in which St Kentigern and his monks angled more than 1200 years ago, was the nucleus of Glasgow. The Church was the nursing mother of the little burgh which grew into greatness under the shadow of the Cathedral, and which has always stood under spiritual obligation, and sometimes has owed very material advantages, to the Church. It was well, therefore, that the representatives of the city should extend a friendly hand to the representatives of the Church—a hand which was grasped in all friendliness. But it is also well that I should say a few words on this occasion, as the representative of other interests than those more specially connected with industrial, commercial, manufacturing, and maritime, Glasgow. The motto of the city, in its old traditional form, whose legitimacy is now, like every historical claimant of belief, critically questioned—the motto,

"Let Glasgow flourish *by the preaching of the Word*"—bears witness to another element in Glasgow's greatness, than its trade, its mines, its shipping, its Exchange. "Man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth." Four hundred years ago, before the pits of Lanarkshire had given up their coal and iron; before the craftsmen of Glasgow had spun a reel of cotton, or the mills of Paisley had twisted a bobbin of thread; before tobacco had been brought from Virginia, or rum and wines for the punch dear to the heart of Bailie Nicol Jarvie had crossed the seas from Jamaica; while salmon could still be netted at the Broomielaw, and the "milky mothers of the herd" were the predominant partners in the Cowcaddens, the University in the High Street was an "excellent, good, cheap mercat of all kinds of knowledge, arts, and sciences," and bore witness, through its long line of teachers and scholars to the truth of the ancient motto —to the supremacy of the realm of reason and idea—and to the reality of the spiritual element, as the root-element, in human life. It is well, therefore, that the representative—unworthy though he be—of the other great Corporation which wields an influence, and has its own subjects and citizens in Glasgow, should join with the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council, in bidding you welcome to the Second City of the Empire.

The interests of the city and the University may seem, to short-sighted people, to lie somewhat apart from each other, but essentially they are one. The University and the Church were, in old times, more closely connected than they are now; but the University, the Church, and the City, at some notable crises in our history, were united in principle and action. It was here, and with the support and sympathy of all classes, that Andrew Melville reorganised the University, which the convulsion of the Reformation had all but overthrown, and through it breathed into the feverous air of Scotland the fresh breath of the Renaissance. It was from Glasgow that the Regent Moray charged out on poor Mary's

troopers at Langside, and secured the Protestant succession to the Scottish throne. It was in the Cathedral that Assembly deliberated which upset the alien Prelacy of Charles I., and gave life and vigour to the policy which ultimately sent him to the block.

In later times of lesser storm and stress, the Church and the country have seen more than once the triumph of principles akin to those of Melville and Henderson; and the city has grown strong and rich through its prescient application of the philosophy of Adam Smith, and its prompt adoption of the discoveries of Watt and Kelvin. Nor can we forget that among the earliest, and certainly the most effective, efforts for the amelioration of the condition of the poor and organised employment of the resources of the Church in their religious supervision and social elevation, were those made by Dr Chalmers in St John's Parish, supported by the co-operation of the civic authorities. While this effort was under the stimulus of his contagious enthusiasm, it achieved results elsewhere unknown, and since then unattained. Unhappy divisions, for which in later years he was himself chiefly responsible, have fatally hindered any renewal of the like attempts. But does not their success while he conducted them, suggest to us the true secret by which alone can such success be gained—the personal devotion of the Christian worker to his work—the "enthusiasm of humanity" to which all movements for human good are possible?

The object of our Conference is the discussion of subjects affecting the practical efficiency of the Church. I suppose its practical efficiency in its parish work and its Home Missions is that in which we feel the most immediate interest. Yet one hears from time to time about disappointments and failure here and there. This church is half empty; that one is doing next to nothing for any Christian cause; in another there is no proof of living interest in the Church's work, no healthy spirit of Churchmanship; its influence is scarcely, if at

all, perceptible in the community; and so on. The tone is one of dissatisfaction and complaint. Is the cause always hard to find? Is it not generally that he, who should be the vital centre of the Church's life, is too lethargic to vitalize anything—his intellectual life undeveloped—his spiritual life benumbed? He is a man who has entered the ministry for a livelihood, and not because he has a zeal for truth, and his heart's desire is to save his brother from ignorance and sin. Be he the minister of a parish or the agent of a mission, he were better hewing wood and drawing water for his daily bread, than trying to raise the people among whom he ministers from the lower to the higher life, without some at least of the "zeal of the Lord of Hosts" in his heart. We are too prone to extol our Church and ourselves—to say it never was more active, never more devoted—never more equal to its work. It may be so, and in many cases is so; but the activity and devotion are not universal. The ministry is sometimes sluggish, the interest slack, the example unedifying. If this Conference can devise some means of quickening the life where it is dull, of touching lips that are cold with fire from the altar, of stirring up the indifferent to a sense of their high duty, of forcing those who have never felt, to feel how noble and divine a service it is to be the ambassador of Christ, it will not have been held in vain.

It may seem an unreal and high-flown way of putting it, but it is true that there should be such an ambassador in every parish. That is the ideal of the parochial ministry; and what is life in the busiest town or in the quietest country without an ideal? This parochial and Home Mission work is our great problem; how to make the Church's influence strong, its voice a mighty voice, its witness for righteousness and truth one that rich and poor, high and low, cannot choose but listen to? To the man plodding through the miry ways of his country parish to visit huts where poor men lie in

want and sickness, and women toil disheartened with their burden, and children loiter in dirt and raggedness; to the man trying hard, and with daily disappointment and defeat, to stem some current in the "loud, stunning tide of human care and crime," in the unclean slums of a city like this; to the man seeking, how often vainly, to instil some principles of self-denial and self-restraint into hearts hardened by the successful pursuit of riches and the self-indulgence of an easy life,—to these how hopeless a business it is apt to seem to make even their bit of so tangled and sorrowful a world better than it is! But to the man who realises that he is the ambassador of Christ nothing appears hopeless. Against him who holds in his heart the high ideal no discouragement can prevail. In every walk of life that which wins a way is the possession of moral and spiritual *ideals*—the capacity of devotion to them—to the verge even of what seems, to the commonplace and uninspired, irrationality—devotion counting not the cost—thinking of no tangible reward;—and in the noblest of all walks in life that of Christ's ambassador, this is most strictly true.

I was reading lately two utterances of very different men bearing on the possibilities that lay before the Christian Church, the one by Thomas Carlyle, the other by Dr Kuenen of Leyden, and I was struck by the contrast of their tones—the pessimistic and the hopeful. Says Carlyle, in a letter to Chalmers, "That you with your generous, hopeful heart believe there may still exist, in our actual Christian churches, enough of divine fire to awaken the supine rich and the degraded poor, and act victoriously against the mass of pressing and ever accumulating evils,—alas, what worse could be said of this by the bitterest opponent of it than that it is a noble hoping against hope? Surely for those that have still such a faith I will vote that they should have all possible room to try it in. With a Chalmers in every British parish much might be possible!" To the pessimist the

only hope for the Church's future, as a saving element in disordered human society, was in the personal faith, the noble effort of the devoted individual—the man burning with a quenchless zeal, and persuaded, as Carlyle himself says, that "if there be not a religious element in the relations of men, such relations are miserable and doomed to ruin." The Dutch divine, not seldom mentioned as a dangerous guide, is speaking of the crisis of these times in which "the ends of the ages meet"—the ends of the old and of the new. "What has Christianity," he says, "to expect from this time of change? The need of it," he answers, "is as keen as ever. It is not for less but for more Christianity that our age cries out. . . . *We have good courage*; not yet is the vital power exhausted which manifested itself so clearly at the rise of the Catholic Church, and again at the Reformation of the sixteenth century. To this our own experience bears witness, and this the future will proclaim." And what was that vital power but the individual force of the divinely-touched personality of Paul, of John, of Clement, of Athanasius, of Columba, of Luther, of Zwingli, of Knox, each energized by the Holy Spirit, and faithful to the light that lightened him within; each, in his days, the witness for his Master, the ambassador of Christ. Τούτῳ νίκα. In this name, in this office, CONQUER.

This idea should dominate all others: this principle take the lead of all. Those in whom the spirit of this conviction lives and moves alone are fit to be leaders in the wars of the Lord. Have we not need of such leaders; shall we say—unhopeful—where is the promise of their coming?

"Sound, thou trumpet of God; come forth, great cause to array us;
King and Leader appear; thy soldiers, sorrowing, seek Thee."

If once you possess a great central principle, the life-forces fall into their right order under it: each takes its proper place and aids in its proper work. The result is freedom, progress, and healthy energy. It is too much the method, in the ecclesiastical world, to lay down rules, to

regulate details, to curb natural vigour by trying, too zealously, to direct its efforts. It is a tendency to be avoided. Where we have a living and expansive activity we should not insist on rules of too strict a uniformity. A man, if he can work strenuously for a good cause at all, will work best when left to his own illustration of the "perfect law of liberty." An old Greek story tells us of a man who was not satisfied with the honey of his bees, the "freeborn wanderers of the mountain air," and by way of improving it, cut off all their wings to prevent their straying beyond the bunches, which he spread before them, of the sweetest flowers he could gather on Hymettus; but after he had deprived them of their wings, the bees would make no honey at all. Which thing is an allegory. While remembering Goethe's maxim, "Only Law can give us liberty," we yet believe that to work usefully we must be free. Your work, of head or hand, will be best done in your own way. Even the wisest of committees might do well to consider this human fact. It is unwise to insist on exact niceties of detail; to pester earnest workers with pedantries; to rub the bloom and freshness off a generous work and a large conception of duty by the friction of the "infinitely little." By constant engrossment with subordinate matters, our minds contract to a narrower circumference, and by-and-bye we lose the capacity of dealing with matters that are really great, and of taking a general view of leading questions of creed or duty. If we give way to this, then in the presence of great problems we shrink nervously from the attempt to solve them. We bring our theological difficulties not to the bar of reason and of the Word of God, but to the measuring-rod of the subordinate standards of our church. In morals we higgle over the amount of recreation that may be allowed to the working man on what we call the "Sabbath day," and how much Sunday labour it is excusable that a pious manufacturer or shipowner should blamelessly exact from his employées, while we turn aside from preaching and practising a high and impartial standard of judgment, mercy, and faith. In

ritual we adorn ourselves as carefully as a bride; we are subtle critics of vestments, nice precisians in order and arrangement, adepts in posture and genuflexion; but are not correspondingly heedful to wear humility as a garment, to be clad with zeal as a cloak, and to be arrayed, over all, in that fine linen, clean and white, which is woven of the righteous deeds of the holy.

I speak of the narrowing effect of preoccupation with minutiæ where great questions are concerned. This has particularly to be guarded against in the department of theologic thought. There are many men—men who are good and able—among the Church's teachers, the free excursions of whose thoughts, in the wide realms of truth, are hampered and restrained by the limitations of local or special formulas. "My spirit," said the Master, "shall lead you into all truth." "I have many things to show you, but you cannot bear them now," implying a perpetual progressive guidance of His Spirit — an extending adaptation of His revelation to the capacity of those to whom He should reveal Himself. Has the Church lived and thought and acted in the faith of this promise? Has it not rather refused to believe it, age after age? Has it not stereotyped His truth as often as it had the opportunity, and said to His revelation: "Hitherto hast thou come, but no farther?" "This is the Catholic faith," says the Athanasian creed of its clusters of incomprehensibilities, "without doubt whosoever does not believe this shall perish everlastingly," upon the whole, perhaps, the most profane formula ever pronounced by a presumptuous dogmatism. But again, and yet again, the same note has been sounded, though in more muffled tones, not alone at Trent, but at Augsburg, at Geneva, at Canterbury, at Westminster. Let us, as Scottish Churchmen, be thankful to God that it was not sounded in our only National Confession, which assumed no infallibility and claimed no finality. "We conjure you," said the authors of the Scots Confession, "if any man will note in this our Confession any article, or sentence, repugnant to God's Holy Word, that it would

please him of his gentleness for Christian charity's sake, to admonish us of the same in writing; and we, upon our honour and fidelity, do promise him satisfaction from the Holy Scriptures, or due reformation of that which he shall prove to be amiss." That is a noble sentence. It is the challenge of the Reformers of our Church to us to be, like them, loyal to the principle of Christian liberty, and of that manly individualism which did not shrink from asserting its right of private judgment, as of more weight with it than the voice of any council or ecclesiastical authority. We have too often let the tradition of the Church fetter this inherent right of the Christian reason and conscience. As often as we do so, we forego the Church's function of taking the lead of Christian thought. Is the Church falling back and ceasing to take that lead? If so, it is because it has renounced its office. "So long as the priests represent God to the people," says Theodore Parker, "they are the strongest class." They are the weakest, if the God they profess to represent is one whom men find it no blessing to believe in—a Deity whose universal fatherhood is hidden behind an arbitrary election and a horrible decree; who has to be propitiated before He is willing to forgive; whose judgment is harsher, and whose love is less ample and free than man's; who keeps the key of a fiery Gehenna, from whose unutterable torments there is no delivery. There are thousands asking the Church to shed some light for them upon "the mystery of all this unintelligible world," to release them from the superstitions which have kept them all their lifetime subject to bondage—to show them THE FATHER. Can the Church do this for them; if not, what else *can* it do?

In your programme for this afternoon I see the subjects are to be the vocation of the Church, and its relation to modern thought. I have no doubt that, in the papers which are to be read and the discussions that are to follow, we shall find some answers to this question, and a full recognition of the responsibility of the Church in regard to it, as a divinely commissioned institution, bound by its very existence to take knowledge, with sympathy and understanding, of the

thoughts that engage thinking men around us. It is the Church's function to illuminate these with the brightness of the Christian intelligence, the Christian consciousness of the present day, and not to vex itself with the problem of how far that light outshines, or blends with, the light of the suns that shone upon our fathers centuries ago.

The attitude of the Church to social and economic movements is another subject affording an opportunity, sure to be wisely used, for philosophic treatment of questions lying close to the foundations of our national welfare and stability. To the meeting set apart for this, working men are "specially invited." If that invitation is accepted, it would add materially to the interest and usefulness of the discussion were some of these working men asked to take part in it, as many of them are thoroughly able to do. The presence of the Lord Provost in the chair may encourage them to do so, if they are possibly shy of engaging any one or all of the four clergymen who have been selected to speak. If I may be allowed to criticise arrangements in which I have not been able to take an active part, I may remark that I should have welcomed a more liberal infusion of the lay element in the proposed proceedings. I observe that on the list of readers of papers and participants in the discussions, there are twenty-one clergymen and no more than six laymen. In the evening meeting on Friday, which the far-reaching results of the insurrection in the Transvaal have obliged us to postpone, the proportion would have been more equal, giving the laity the larger share by five to two.

Another very vital subject is that of the Church's relation to the young, and to education. The direct influence on education, which the Church formerly could exercise through its connection with the parish schools, cannot now be exercised in the same way and to the same extent. What is called "Religious Education" is at a discount with School Boards and teachers, owing to the practical exclusion of it from a share in Government grants and inspections. What is the effect of this on the pupils in the primary schools it

is hard to say. No so-called religious education can be worth much unless imparted in a religious spirit, and this no system can insure. But the loss is an immense one apart from directly religious considerations, when children are brought up in virtual ignorance of the peerless *literature* of the Bible, as many of them must be, if it is never read and studied in school. No other literature can supply its place, and too often the book of books is never opened or heard of in the home. The education of the home is more impressive and important than that of either school or church. We shall best improve its quality and promote its efficiency by helping the parents to understand their responsibility for it, and to realise the life-long results their precept and example are sure to have in moulding the character of their children. The Christian home is the best guarantee for, and school of, a religious education. Looking back upon a life-time one is apt to become "laudator temporis acti," and to complain that the former days were better than these; but making all allowance for this tendency, I do not think it tempts me to malign the rising generation, when I say that whether on the country road or the streets of the town, their manners seem distinctly deteriorated from those of their fathers; and manners are a pretty correct index of character. We cannot help surmising that there can be little proper authority and good example in the home and in the school, when the youngsters are so ill-bred, disrespectful, and coarse in manner and language as they commonly are. It is discouraging to forecast the future of a population growing up from such beginnings. This problem of the upbringing of the young, not only in knowledge, but in morals, is as serious a problem as can engage your attention.

You will have much to consider in the two days of your session—too much, perhaps, for exhaustive consideration. I trust no question will be so discussed as to cause any brother to offend—even the "weak brother," if he be here. At the same time, I hope there will be perfect liberty of discussion. A conference like this, without that, tongue-tied, is of no use. It is meant to promote the free utter-

ance of thought and opinion, and to afford an arena for the exercise of the greatest power in the world—man's free speech to man. It is not intended to be a mere reproduction of the General Assembly. It must be less formal,—may we hope it will be, at some points, not less interesting? We shall have no committees giving in reports; no transgressors at the bar, with counsel for "the libel" and for the appellant; no learned procurator to point our way; no Lord High Commissioner to survey the scene from the serene altitude of the throne. There may be here matter for thankfulness, as well as for regret. We may hope that in our debates, not the friends of the Church only, but an intelligent public in general, will find matter to enlarge their thoughts, and to stimulate their interest in doing good as they have opportunity. We should not object to any amount of candid criticism or frank disputation. Above the chair of the grandest embodiment of intellectual power I ever knew, Sir William Hamilton of Edinburgh, there was inscribed in golden letters the motto, "Truth's like a torch: the more it's shook it shines." I think some of that great man's disciples have often recalled these words, and found in them "strong consolation" in times when they were wearied with the strife of tongues; when, more in sorrow than in anger, they heard venerable beliefs impugned, or fantastic novelties announced as if revelations from on high; when they saw the "fair humanities of old religion" derided, and human dogmas, cold and narrow as the grave, proclaimed as the very word of God,—and there may be some such here, pious souls, hoping for help, yet timid and uncertain whither to turn, or where to seek for light. If the light may seem now and again to lose its brightness, and to cast but wavering rays because the torch is rudely shaken, let them not be afraid for *it*. No angry or poisonous blast can quench it, no hostile hand can cast it down. Its destiny is to fulfil to many a waiting eye the ancient promise, "Unto the upright ariseth light in the darkness," as it shines more and more unto the perfect day. Let us ever have a firm faith in the impregnability of the truth of God—be un-

satisfied until we walk consciously in its light, and in all our thought and effort know assuredly that we have it for our guide: for we are "children of light and children of the day, we are not of the night nor of darkness."

FIRST MEETING FOR DISCUSSION.

Thursday, October 26th, 3 to 6 p.m.

THE CHURCH: (*A*) ITS VOCATION.

Papers.

The Very Rev. Dr Leishman.—In an assemblage whose composition and purpose were less defined than ours, such a subject as the Vocation of the Church might invite illimitable controversy. For the first question to be determined would be, where is the Church? But we, members of the Scottish Church, met together to take counsel for her welfare, assume her catholicity. Still it is well to begin our work by analyzing our own convictions on this matter, since the subject may be more complex than we suppose. This is acknowledged in the first words of the Concordat, which our Church soon after her reformation made with the civil power, and from which neither party has since resiled. The Second Book of Discipline opens thus: "The Kirk of God is sometimes largely taken for all them that profess the Evangel of Jesus Christ, and so is a company and fellowship, not only of the godly, but also of hypocrites, professing always outwardly the true religion. Other times it is taken for the godly and elect only, and sometimes for them that exercise spiritual functions among the congregations of them that profess the truth. The Kirk in this last sense has a certain power granted by God according to which it uses a proper jurisdiction and government exercised to the comfort of the whole Kirk." In their thoughts and words regarding the

Church, men do not always keep these three conceptions distinct; or on the other hand they treat of them as if they were contradictories. Of the two first, the Church visible and invisible, our Confession says that both are Catholic or Universal. Much bitter controversy might be avoided if men would consider that on earth these two bodies are not rival corporations, but that from the centre outwards, they are for some way one, and that the dispute is only as to the relation borne to the whole by those who have been received into the Church's ranks without accepting its duties, or owning personal affiance in its Head. Yet He Himself has said of this foreign element that it cannot be detached from the kingdom of heaven till the time of harvest. But for it the relation to each other of the Church visible and invisible would be not unlike that of body and soul, forming one personality. But while the unity of the natural body is a fact evident and unchallengeable because of the visible limitations of its form, the outlines by which the fair proportions of the body of Christ might be manifest to our vision are obscured by discord and sin. This obscuration of what we know to be there may have been in the thoughts of those who framed our last Confession when they said that "the Catholic Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible." After all, the Church which we see or search for now and here, bears no more proportion to that which is being gathered round the feet of God, than the open page of a volume does to the pages already read, and those which the eye has not yet seen. When we thus compare the imperfect with the perfect, the fragment with the mass, there is no question which is the greater. In the other life there can be no distinction as between visible and invisible, for in the light of God's presence the Church of the redeemed must stand fully revealed.

Our Church then discriminated between the Church visible on earth and that inner communion to which the notes of holiness and catholicity properly belong, but whose

boundaries evade our sight. But she also held that the permanence of both depended on outward offices and ordinances instituted by her Head while He abode visibly on earth, and which He intended to be continued till He is seen again. The members of our Church have not always kept at this point the true balance of belief. There has always been among us a bias towards the side of individualism, neglecting that ideal of earthly unity, which, with other counsels of perfection, we ought to keep in sight. There are those who suppose that because the fulfilment of this conception of unity seems in the meantime to be unattainable, the next best thing to be desired is the stimulus of general disunion. But many are coming to see that the evils which arise from this are more evident than the blessings, and that unity in the visible body is the right way of approach to that identity which should be the normal relation of the visible and invisible church. One step towards the restoration of at least national unity would be the cessation of disunion within the National Church. Though our differences have not gone so far as to perpetuate themselves by what our fathers called setting up altar against altar, they are serious enough to put a vigorous retort into the mouths of the promoters of schism, and neutralize the endeavours of those who would fain help in healing breaches that are already made.

When, following the Book of Discipline, we think of the relation in which the visible stands to what we may call the official church, here too distinction need not imply antagonism. Too often we hear the truism that "the clergy are not the Church" repeated so as to suggest this. It seems a pointless assertion when applied to a church, whose ministers are aided in their teaching functions by licentiates without ordination, and in their function of discipline by the lay eldership. Our Church and ministry are not rivals, as some do their best to make them. The smaller body is only the instrument through which Christ creates, expands, perpetuates the greater. To quote again

the Book of Discipline: "This power ecclesiastical flows immediately from God and the Mediator Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth, but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of His Kirk." Those who speak of the office-bearers of the Church and its people as having opposing interests, are probably misled by a supposed analogy between the constitution of Christ's Church and the representative principle in our political life. In their eyes the ministry are delegates, not of the Head but of the members, subordinate therefore and responsible to them, and when questions arise as between these two sources of mission, misunderstanding and jealousy are the result. According to our system and its standards, the opinion that a pastor's commission originates with the congregation which receives his ministrations, is not Presbyterianism but Independency, even if it be veiled by Presbyterian forms. The people have at one stage a choice, but it is restricted to the limited body of probationers who have had their fitness previously tested and attested by the office-bearers of the Church at large. A second enquiry by the same authority is requisite to sanction the selection made. It has to be validated by a solemn ordinance in which the vacant congregation takes no part. And by that ordinance the minister is further invested with the duty of ruling over many other congregations to whom he may be unknown by sight or name. This consecration, independent of his own flock though it be, does not make him and his order lords over God's heritage. It but retains them in the service of the heavenly Master, only with new and awful responsibilities. It makes them servants for Jesus' sake of those for whom He died. But it is from Himself that the designation to this double service comes.

In all our deliberations then let us keep before us this threefold conception of the Church as it was defined by our fathers. We shall have to deal mainly with the duties laid on us as members of the visible body of federated

Christians, on every one of us by our baptism, on many by ordination, on others by self-dedication to various forms of service which Christian wisdom and experience have devised. But with a present interest in the various activities of our holy fellowship, let our final aim be so to live "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," that one and all whom we can influence may have assurance of their membership in the great Church at rest.

These obligations in their entirety constitute the vocation of the earthly Church. Much will have to be said here of the duties of office-bearers, but we shall be better prepared for discussions in this narrower field if the thought is never absent from our minds that our Lord claims the service of every baptized soul. This is the initial vocation of every official, strengthened, not superseded by the special duties committed to him in later years. All who reach the age of responsibility have some new obligations superinduced on those which were laid on them on that unremembered day when, in the words of the Larger Catechism, "they were solemnly admitted into the visible Church, and entered into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's." The only difference is that these supplementary duties are in one set of cases imposed by the place which God has assigned to them in the family or the community, in another by their voluntary acceptance of offices instituted by Christ in His Church. Every day we come on traces of an opinion, not formally stated, but acted on by professed Christians, that their Lord looks for no active work from them, so long as they do not volunteer for it. Could this be if they were accustomed to ask themselves, "Is there no service which the great Taskmaster has laid to my hand, because my place in His world makes me more competent for it than others?" Rather their opinion seems to be that on the principle of division of labour so serviceable in secular occupations, certain sections of the community are set apart to live the religious life, to

press religious belief and duty on the rest, and so to be responsible for the religiousness of the human family, while others content themselves, if they will, with an easier morality or a more nebulous faith. And when some blot on the nation's escutcheon is pointed to, it is accounted for by the negligence of the various ministries of the Church. But how can they influence those who, if they do not keep aloof from ordinances, give a cold and irregular attendance on them, steeling their hearts against everything that touches conscience, and interested only in what appeals to the æsthetic or intellectual side of their nature. Do what ministers may, how can they counterwork the more direct and continuous influence of careless parents, the conventional meannesses which in so many avocations are, as the phrase is, "things always understood," or the poison of foul or malignant literature. Among those who do not disown religion this strange inconsistency is sometimes observable, that while on the watch to criticise or obstruct office-bearers, who are deeply impressed with the importance of duties that are admittedly the differentia of their offices, they insist on their close attention to other duties in which the laity ought to be their helpers, such as the visitation of the sick or work among the very poor. Without entering on the vexed question of the point at which separation ought to be made between official and non-official preaching, how many opportunities might an earnest layman find of using his gifts of knowledge, or experience, or ready speech for the instruction of others, or in private life of commending to them the truths of God or the supreme value of the soul. Cavillers speak at times of the priesthood of all believers. The doctrine is a scriptural one, and as a controversial position unassailable. But of those who on occasion speak of it, how few act on it, or meditating on it, are led onwards to rest on the higher priesthood, the priesthood of the one Mediator, Who hath made atonement for them, and while pleading it for them continually at the right hand of the Father, never ceases to

call on them by His Word and Spirit to be every one in his place and measure a fellow-worker with Him.

Rev. Professor Paterson, D.D., Aberdeen.—By the vocation of the Church I understand what is more commonly described as the end of the Church; and agreeably to this title the task will be to define the objects for which the Church exists, and also so far to gauge the means at its disposal for the fulfilment of its mission. It may further be premised that we here limit our attention to the Church on earth—excluding from view the Church in heaven with all that faith holds as to its worship, and all that speculation has hazarded as to its ministry, in the worlds behind the veil.

The end of the Church, expressed in most general terms, is the advancement of the Kingdom of God. But this statement, correct so far as it goes, is not sufficiently distinctive, inasmuch as there are other institutions—notably the family, the school, and the state—which also serve as instruments for the advancement of the Kingdom of God upon earth. The further desideratum is the discovery of a guiding principle which will indicate the special sphere in which the Church has to operate, and also the characteristic activities by which it has to contribute to the realisation of the great common end. And this want is most satisfactorily met by recurring to the work of Christ, and by conceiving the mission of the Church as determined, in respect of aim, and also generally of sphere and methods, by Christ's saving mission to the world. We might even adopt a widely current formula, and say that the Church exists to carry on the work of its Founder and Head. This formula, however, is an ambiguous one which can be employed partially to express, but partially also to conceal, two widely diverging conceptions of the function of the Church; and it is therefore desirable to consider more closely how the principle in question is to be worked out in detail.

According to one view the works of Christ which the

Church exists to carry on connect themselves with the three offices of Christ. "The Church," says Canon Gore, "perpetuates the mission of her Master—prophetic, priestly, and kingly" ("Mission of the Church," p. 6). But this method of developing the idea is both unjustifiable and dangerous. The Church is, no doubt, Christ's main instrument for the furtherance of His kingdom upon earth, but it does not follow that the instrument represents Him in His exalted dignities, and shares in His vast prerogatives. To carry out a king's behests is not to rule, nor is a prophet's mouthpiece a prophet. Further, the conception of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King borrows much from our representations of His power and His activities in His state of exaltation, and as the Church, in its present stadium, is not glorified, but imperfect, suffering, militant, it must be regarded as highly presumptuous that it should identify its commission with that of its glorified Head. Moreover, the interpretation of the Church's work as a continuation of our Lord's in His three offices leads directly to dangerous errors and intolerable claims. Does it carry on His priestly work? The sacrifice of Christ demands its counterpart in a perpetual oblation to be offered by the Church; and with a revival of sacrifice the minister is transformed into the priest. Does it carry on the kingly work? Obedience to the Church, as once before, must logically become the chiefest virtue, and it is not easy to see why the Church should sink her claim to dominate the state. We may, indeed, draw milder inferences—construing the perpetual sacrifice as an offering of faith and devotion, the Kingship of the Church as merely implying that the revealed will of God should be supreme throughout His world; but if we do not mean all that is naturally involved in priesthood and kingship when we predicate them of the Church, it is better to employ different language.

The instinct which prompts us to revert to the work of Christ for guidance is sound, but in this connection we have to look for direction to a definite phase of His work, viz., the

earthly ministry, and, on the whole, the Church's work may be best described as an imitation, rather than a carrying on of our Lord's work on earth. The end of the Church will thus be more exactly defined as the imitation of Christ in respect of His works recorded in the Gospels, which were briefly three—communication of divine truth, spiritual ministry, and philanthropy. "As my Father hath sent me," said Jesus, "even so send I you" (John xx. 21).

1. The earthly work of our Lord consisted to a large extent in the revelation and illustration of truth. Practical as His aim commonly was, He conveyed through the threefold channel of His words, His works, and His person, a set of truths which, with the further elucidation by His apostles, outline a view of the universe and of human deliverance and destiny in which the intellect equally with the heart has been able to rest with satisfaction. What, now, is to be said of the duty and the powers of the Church in relation to this crowning revelation in Christ of which the New Testament Scriptures are the principal record and deposit? In the first place obviously to understand it, to elucidate it, to propagate it, to defend it. Conflict of opinion arises over the question whether the Church further shares in the authority which we ascribe to Christ in regard to divine things, and is to be regarded as the infallible interpreter of Revelation. Thus to some, in determining the sense of a particular passage of Scripture, the primary question is what the Church, speaking by the fathers, has taken it to mean, the quite secondary one what scientific exegesis may show the scriptural writer to have originally meant. For us practically, however, the question of the authority of the Church in matters of doctrine emerges in connection with the status of the creeds. Probably no one contends that the Westminster Confession is infallible because it was approved by our Church, but there is a large body of opinion represented not only in the Roman and Anglican Communions, but in our own, which is prepared to claim authority for the Nicene Creed, with its supplements, on the

ground of their having been framed and accepted by the ancient and undivided Church. But can we claim any exceptional authority for the patristic church? Undivided it certainly was, but it is equally true that it was a fragmentary church—including the Græco-Latin races and some Celtic families, it had not yet gathered into its fold the group of Germanic peoples with their splendid endowment of intellectual power, moral earnestness, and religious insight; and if the authority of the Church is to count for anything it may, in my view, be most properly claimed in regard to ourselves on behalf of the substance of those confessions in which our branch of the race recorded its deep understanding of the essence of Christianity. In reality, however, binding authority can be claimed for neither on the ground of a commission of the Church; but as our own Confession teaches, "The supreme Judge by which all decrees of councils, etc., are to be examined can be no other but the Holy Ghost speaking in the Scripture" (Ch. I., § 10).[1]

2. The second division of our Lord's work, and withal its central feature, was spiritual ministry. The primary object of His care, beyond all doubt, was the spiritual well-being of souls. The stages in His work were to call sinners unto repentance for the forgiveness of sins, to build up the characters of His disciples in conformity with the most lofty standard of righteousness, and so at once to make them the lights of the world and heirs of an everlasting inheritance. And similarly, in the imitation of the spiritual ministry of Christ, taking the two main forms of missionary effort and pastoral care, the Church finds its chief end. Divergence of opinion begins, or becomes most acute, when we reflect

[1] This canon, it is true, cannot mean precisely the same for us as for the Westminster Divines. They did not realise the divine human character of Scripture, or the progressiveness of Revelation, and by them accordingly any text torn from its context might be used to solve a theological problem. For modern theology authority attaches to the system of Revelation which the Scriptures make known to us, but with which they are not coterminous. The determination and explication of the contents of this Revelation has been gradual and is not yet completed.

upon her very moderate success, and consider by what means her spiritual power may be increased. As regards missionary effort, it must be admitted, whatever success may have attended foreign missions in some parts of the world, the Church has not really caught the ear of, or at any rate really impressed, the multitudes in our own country that have relapsed into heathenism and animalism. I go on to the second point, that those who enjoy the sustained pastoral care of the Church, and make use of its means of grace, do not on the whole impress us as exhibiting steadily increasing strength and nobility of Christian character. That they owe much to the ministrations of the Church as preventing deterioration, and helping them to stand their ground, is probably true: that the majority do no more is certain. And in view of this fact it is inevitable that earnest men should be asking what can be done more effectually to promote the moral and spiritual growth of Church members, and to bring Christian character and life into closer correspondence with Christian profession. One suggestion not infrequently heard is that the remedy is to be found in a higher appreciation of the sacraments, and, in particular, in the introduction of much more frequent celebration, preferably weekly, of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To this there is the objection that it would be apt fundamentally to alter the traditional character of our ordinary services, which have hitherto been based upon the Protestant view of the pre-eminent importance of the word of God, and which, besides, hitherto seem to have laid hold, as no other form of service has done, of the manhood of a great country. But apart from this, does experience warrant us in expecting that a sacramentarian revival would bring a great accession of spiritual and moral power? Other national Churches have the weekly celebration of the Eucharist, some, too, among ourselves of little note, but there is not less complaint among them than among us of stagnation and of lack of inspiration and endeavour. For myself I humbly think that in the future as in the past the

principal instrument of God for the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints will be the Word of God working in and through believing, earnest, prayerful, fire-baptised men. We believe that Revelation, which began with a dispensation of rites and ceremonies, reached its culmination, and discovered its source of irresistible power, when the Word became incarnate; and these dealings of God with the world are in some measure re-capitulated when to a congregation, stationary among its religious forms, there is given the ministry of a Christ-like man. In saying this I do not refer merely to preaching—pre-eminently important as this is in Scotland—but also to the power exerted by a man who has the gift of influence, and who carries about with him a permanently visible equipment of Christian sympathy, and principle, and faith. We need undervalue no means of grace; this we cannot over-value; for it too urgently pray. As regards the laity, the strong Christian personality, capable of leading and leavening a social circle, may still be described as, on the whole, our Church's buried talent.

3. The spiritual mission of our Lord was fulfilled in a setting of philanthropy. The works of mercy here referred to had a twofold spring. To a large extent they may be viewed as simply the inevitable response of the sympathetic Christ to the suffering and sorrow with which He was brought into contact. To some extent, also, they had the character of a means to an end—serving the purpose of opening the ear of the distressed to His spiritual message, or generally of accrediting His ministry. Under the influence of the first motive, the Church has ever regarded as her peculiar responsibility a ministry of healing and consolation to the sons and daughters of affliction. To feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to tend the sick, to welcome the stranger, to visit the captive, to comfort the mourner —has been from of old her recognised programme, accomplished partly by institutions which she created, partly by private charities which she inspired. And if in these

latter days she has seen these responsibilities largely taken over by others, *e.g.* the relief of the poor by the State, the upkeep of hospitals by the general community, it is less matter of regret that in so doing she has parted with a source of influence than of thankfulness that she has educated the State, with its more adequate resources, to admit, at least in an elementary form, the responsibility for the relief of the poor. It may be added that the Church, which educated the conscience of the State to the point of undertaking works of mercy, cannot but most heartily encourage and support its pupil, now that he is meditating more humane provisions for the treatment of God's poor in the adequate support of the worn-out workers. From another starting-point, the Church, like her Master, travels into the social field. Where the material environment of a part of the population is recognised to be such as to render human beings practically inaccessible to her spiritual ministry, or where the conditions under which the work of the world is done are such as to make a Christian life a virtual impossibility, she cannot, without guilt, withhold a testimony of protest, or evade the task of educating the civic conscience to the fuller realisation of the obligation which rests upon the State through its various organs to make use of its power, its wisdom, and its resources for the advancement of the Kingdom of God.

In modern times the dissolution of the Church has been predicted from two points of view. The assertion of unbelief that it is founded on illusion, and must disappear with all else so bottomed, is ruled out by Matt. xvi. 18. Others who have accepted the Christian faith and aims have yet held with Rothe that its functions would become merged in the State. But for two reasons such absorption could not be accepted by the Church. It would involve the subordination of believers to a mundane authority —an unqualified Erastianism. And it is unlikely that the State of the future would undertake the mission of the Church in its entirety. Even if the State identified itself more and more with the philanthropic work formerly

assigned to the Church, and if our schools were to become more consciously schools of character, it is improbable that the State would desire to dispense the means of grace, or to organise missionary effort. For worship, witness-bearing, and the shepherding of men and women, the Church has a mission, as a distinct institution, until the end.

Speakers.

Rev. Professor Herkless, D.D.—No one ought to know better than a student of history how necessary it is for the Church from time to time to consider its relation to the people, and how it is best able to meet their religious needs. I am aware that this subject is large enough to occupy the whole time of a congress; but I shall, in the few minutes given to me, confine myself to points which have some connection with my work as a teacher. The first point I merely mention. The present training of our theological students is meagre and inadequate when we contrast it with what is given in Germany and America, and with what is likely to be given in the halls of the Church to be formed from the Free and U.P. Churches. Now this subject is merely mentioned, not discussed; but the fact is to be noted that the present training is inadequate, and that the intellectual efficiency of the future ministers will demand the subject to be discussed. We may require four years of professional training instead of three; we certainly require more subjects to be taught, and require more teachers. I come now to a second point. The late Dr Macleod of Govan had a scheme for halls of residence for Divinity students in which, apart from the universities, additional teaching was to be given on subjects, such as pastoral theology. In these halls it was also intended that there should be spiritual as well as intellectual training. At the present time the Church does nothing to foster the spiritual life of the young men who are to be ministers; and, looking back to my own

university life, and seeing now, from another position, what the training of students is, I say deliberately that there is a serious demand for a more spiritual training. The theological professors are professors of a university; and each man's first duty as such is to teach his subject as a science. It is a mere commonplace to say that intellectual training is not sufficient for the work of the ministry; and surely it is the Church's duty to supplement the intellectual education which the universities supply. There is no time for me to suggest plans, but only to emphasize the fact of which I speak. We are familiar with the word atmosphere which, *e.g.* Mr Balfour used in the debate on the Irish University. We need a spiritual atmosphere in our halls, and, with all respect, I say that the Home Mission Committee, instead of sending lecturers to give six or eight formal addresses on pastoral theology, would do well to arrange that men of religious experience, ministers or teachers, should associate more closely with the students than a stranger or formal lecturer is able to do. I lay before you the fact that we need spiritual as well as intellectual training in our halls. This may be said by the way, that I have arranged with my colleagues, and have proposed to the students that we spend some of our Sunday evenings this session in what may be called "Talks about Religion."

I come now to a third point. A probationer's life is not a happy one. The day he is licensed he is introduced into what, I say it calmly, is vulgar competition. There is no man or body of men with authority to help him to reach that work for which he has been training, and he is simply allowed to go on his own ways. The diminution in the number of Divinity students is due to many causes, but one serious cause is the neglect shown to licentiates which makes their position probably the least enviable in the whole professional world. It seems impossible to get rid of competition under the system of popular election, and we cannot interfere with the right of a congregation to choose its minister; but these congregations are looking for the right man,

they are not disloyal to the best interests of the Church, and therefore it ought not to be beyond the wit of the General Assembly to devise means whereby the principle of rotation might be at least partially recognised when a leet is formed—that principle which commends itself to the probationers at the present day. If we are in earnest something may be done to improve the status of the licentiate.

I come now to the last point, and the word superintendent must be used. The parochial system is excellent in that it secures a man for every parish to perform the functions of the Church; but it fails in this that it does not secure from one end of the year to the other, and perhaps throughout a whole generation, any variety. It is not to use the language of cant to say that we need a quickening of the religious life in all parishes, and not least in those distant from large centres. When I was a parish minister I greatly desired someone to advise, stimulate, and assist me, and to bring fresh spiritual life into my congregation. Now I use the word superintendent, but I do not think of a moral or spiritual inspector. The way to avoid congregationalism, to avoid what is worse, stagnation in our parishes, is to have men of religious sense and experience to help minister and people alike. The Committee on the social and spiritual life of the people showed what could be done, but they are not going again over the country. I know that the appointment of superintendents means money; I know that many think superintendents would mean bishops, and that Presbyterian equality would be destroyed. A small schoolboy could learn enough church history to know that bishops and superintendents are very different officials. We want spiritual efficiency, the religious life to be quickened—that is the supreme consideration. Presbyterial superintendence amounts to an inspection of statistics, but it does not touch the religious life of the people by bringing to it the influences, apart from the local clergy, of wise men specially fitted to inspire

earnestness. And might not these superintendents come to the aid of probationers by recommending them for work which they know they can do.

In what has been said of students, licentiates, and ministers mere suggestions have been made. I know enough of the history of the Church to say that when the efficiency of the clergy is increased, the work of religion prospers; and through these clergy, the Church will be able to be true to its vocation.

Rev. J. Rudge Wilson, M.A. — I rise with some diffidence, at the invitation of the Committee, to offer a few remarks on the great subject—the Vocation of the Church — which we have met to discuss. I regret that I have not had the advantage of knowing beforehand the scope of the papers which have been read. In these circumstances I must crave the indulgence of the Congress if I revert to points of view which have been already presented.

The *Vocation* of the Church. Then the Church has a vocation. It exists in virtue of a divine call to fulfil a definite function. I am grateful to the Committee for having placed in the forefront of the programme of the first Church of Scotland Congress the suggestion of this sublime and far-reaching thought. The Church—the corporate body—the communion of saints—of those, by whatever name they may be known, who profess and call themselves Christians—is not a mere accident, it is an *election*. It has been called out of the world by God. Its title-deeds and charter are not of its own devising. It is composed not of those who have happened to find themselves possessed of common opinions and so have chosen to combine together in a society for the furtherance of certain common objects—framing for themselves a constitution, and bye-laws and standing orders—but of those who have been definitely called out of the world by God, to do for God a definite work in the world. Its charter and its commission are united in the creative word—"Ye have not chosen Me, but I have

chosen you and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit."

Now, for the Church to recognise this—to set to work in the full, clear consciousness of this, its vocation—is a matter of vital, practical moment. For only thus can she be saved at once from aimlessness and from hopelessness. Only as the Church recognises her vocation will she see clearly what work she is definitely intended to do. She will be saved from feeling about, trying her hand at this thing and the other thing, running to and fro across the whole field of human experience, instead of fixing her eyes on a definite goal and making straight for it. And from hopelessness: for unless the Church believe in her vocation, she can have no assurance that her efforts will fare better in the long-run than the efforts of many a philanthropic society of human invention which has had its day. If the Church has been called out of the world to do a definite work for God, then she has the pledge that the Lord will be with her alway, even to the end. The gates of hell shall not prevail against her.

We speak of the Church as the Body of Christ. In that apostolic phrase we have the whole sum and substance of the truth of the Church's vocation. Does the phrase stand for a reality, or is it a mere pictorial figure of speech? Even if it be a figure of speech, as in one sense of course it is, must we not take it to have been—from its reiterated use—the very best figure the Apostle could find in which to reveal not a mere imaginative fancy, but a veritable and substantial reality? For my own part, the teaching of a great part of the New Testament becomes meaningless unless I can hold that when St Paul used the phrase he wished us to understand that the Church—the whole company of professing Christians—is meant to be as really the very body of the Ascended Lord as was the body of flesh and blood in which the Eternal Son was incarnate in Bethlehem of Judæa. And here I take those other words of Christ—"As Thou hast sent me into the world,

even so have I also sent them into the world." "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

To be in the world as Christ, the Incarnate Son, was in the world, to have received a divine commission from Him as He had received from His Father, that is the vocation of the Church. To believe that, to live and pray and work under the supreme, inspiring dominion of that great thought, is what is required of the Church in every age and not least in this age of ours.

That, I take it, is to be the keynote of this Congress. At this first diet the subject must necessarily be treated very generally, rather in the way of suggesting fundamental principles and lines of thought, which may be discussed in greater detail at future diets.

It belongs to the vocation of the Church, then, as I conceive it—

(1) To declare the truth: not to invent truth, not to discover truth: but to declare the truth as it has been committed to it.

It was our Lord's own account of His own teaching. "As My Father hath taught Me, I speak these things." "I have not spoken of Myself, but the Father which sent Me, He gave Me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak." And so His teaching admits of no hesitancy, no doubt, no weakness of half-hearted apology. "Verily, verily I say unto you, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen."

To speak, to testify, to declare the truth like that is the vocation of the Church. The Church must be impotent as a witness which does not recognise that the truth as it is in Jesus has been committed unto her. The Church is not called to invent new truth, much less to minimise the message, or to waste strength in discovering interesting parallels, it may be, as some have fancied, superior aspects of truth in other religious systems. The Church is required to declare definitely and distinctly what she has seen and heard. The Faith as once delivered to the Saints, the

Creed in its catholic exposition: to declare that, to contend earnestly for that, is the great task of the Church in this aspect of its vocation.

This is the work to which the Church is peculiarly called in our own day; a work the Church can only fulfil in so far as she believes in herself. Men want definite teaching. If the Church believes she has the truth of God delivered to her, the one great illumining, redeeming, sanctifying truth of God's Incarnate Son, then in God's name let her say so. Men will welcome her teaching. But if the Church hesitates and wavers, if the Church refuses to declare what she professes to believe, if the Church cannot speak in Christ's name, and so with authority, "This is the truth, receive it; this is the faith, believe it; this is the way, walk ye in it," she must not wonder if men pass her by. Men are said to be impatient of doctrinal teaching. I don't believe it. They do not resent the dogmas of science when these are taught with the authority which springs from knowledge. What they do resent and are impatient of is a doctrine feebly proclaimed, with hesitation, without conviction, a doctrine which seems to lack reality for him who teaches it, which represents no living faith, and is fruitful even in the teachers of no corresponding action. Men will not rally to a church which more than insinuates doubt as to its own right to teach. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

"That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." Thus the faith was propagated in the first days. Thus it must still be propagated. To recognise that the Church has a definite faith, the faith that Jesus is the Son of God, with all that flows therefrom—a heritage of Catholic truth enshrined in her Catholic creeds—to declare it, to expound it, to exhibit its reasonableness, to oppose it as an impregnable rock against every attack of materialistic agnosticism, to bear it aloft before the world as a standard of eternal witness, to exhibit it as the light without which all is dark within and around—that I take it

in one aspect is the vocation of the Church of God to-day.

And it belongs to the vocation of the Church—

(2) To manifest life.

The Church is the Body of Christ. The Church must be the re-incarnation of the Son of God: the Church must be Christ in the world. The earthly life of Jesus had two aspects, two sides, an inner and an outer—one towards the Father, the other towards His brethren of mankind. The one was the sphere of spiritual communion, the other the sphere of active ministry. So the Church is called to manifest the Christ life in worship and in work. The Church, then, must be the home of prayer, of worship, of devotion. The Church does not fulfil its vocation unless it set before itself as a definite aim, to be attained by the employment of definite means, the fostering of the spiritual life, at once in the common worship of the congregation, and in the personal life of individual souls. It is a question which may well cause deep searching of heart—how far we have been doing this. Has there not been a danger, of recent years, that with much fussiness about organisations manifold we may have been neglecting that one thing needful, the fostering of the spiritual life, the life which lives in Christ and in which Christ lives, the life whose ideal is to be "hid with Christ in God." If the Church is to manifest Christ's life on this its heavenly side, must there not be more definite teaching regarding the meaning of worship, and a quickening of the sense of the Lord's presence in the Holy Sacrament, and careful training of the young in habits of personal devotion? Towards the Father: that must be one aspect of the Church's life; and then towards the brethren. The home of worship, the Church must be also a hive of work. The Church must manifest, in something of its gracious adaptation to all human need, the very life of the Saviour. She must set herself in activities manifold to deal the Bread of Life to the hungry, to care for the poor and desolate, to bring encouragement to the toilers, and

healing to the sick, and even recreation to the weary, saying to one and all, "Be of good cheer, it is I, be not afraid."

In all this its manifestation of the life of Christ, the Church must set the highest standard. It must remember it is here to be the very brightness of the Saviour's glory, the express image of His person. "I am no more in the world, but these are in the world." Thus the Church must prove itself what our Lord was to the men of His time, an incarnate conscience; a voice testifying for righteousness, and by its very existence shaming the faithless, rebuking the disobedient. "For their sakes I sanctify myself."

Permit me to add that, in my view, it belongs to the vocation of the Church, and this supremely—

(3) To redeem the world.

Here again the Church must show itself to be the very Body of Christ, of Him who "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

The Church is chosen, called of God, an elect race. Can that election be justified? Only if we remember the purpose of the election. That *we* should be chosen to be the heirs of the promises while the heathen in millions are left in ignorance—such an election could scarce be justified. But that we should be chosen in order to be missionaries, evangelists to others, that the Church should be elected for the sake of the world—such an election is in accordance with all we know of the divine dealings everywhere. "God uses us to help each other so, lending our minds out." God uses the Church to redeem the world, lending out not men's minds, but the whole spiritual character and experience of His saints. The Church is called—this is its one clear call—to work, and pray, and suffer, for the sake of the world. The Church complains—with too good reason—that its missions flag for want of interest. The remedy must be sought, not in spasmodic efforts, not in temporary stimulants and tonics, but in a revival in the minds of men of the

inspiring thought of the divine vocation of the Church to be the very Body of Christ. That is not the thought which has influenced our Church for many a long day. Men have been content with meaner motives and lower ideals. They will never be moved to make sacrifices for the world until they are brought to believe that God has called them out of the world, and endowed them with special privileges above their brethren, not that they may thank God that their own souls have been saved, but that they may prove themselves living members of Christ's glorious Body, that they may justify their election by *shewing forth* the excellencies of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His own marvellous light.

"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life"; that is the Lord's word which the Church is called to repeat, and exemplify, and re-incarnate.

I am the Truth: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

I am the Life: "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly."

I am the Way: "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me."

That is the vocation. The vocation becomes a source of living power in proportion as we believe that Christ the Son of God is with His Church in all its witnessing, in all its worship, in all its work, and in all its sacrifice.

I am sure it is the earnest hope and prayer of every one of us that this Congress may help the Church to realise its vocation and to walk worthy of its high calling in Christ Jesus.

Discussion.

Professor Cooper said that the vocation of the Church was summed up in the text which was her charter (St Matthew xxviii. 18-20). There we had, in the first place, Christ's relation to the Church. He is not to be to her

simply a memory. He is a living presence: "Lo, I am with you alway even to the end of the world." And what is the Church to Christ? Not a circle of admirers cultivating a fading memory, but His body living in Him—life in Christ. "Apart from Me, ye can do nothing." Then in the commission based on the presence with her of Him, her glorified Head, there are three departments—(1) the preaching of the Faith, to make known to all nations the facts of the Gospel and persuade them to belief therein; (2) the administration to those won to this belief and their children, of the Sacraments of Union with Him in whom they have believed. It is Christ Himself, be it noted, who puts Baptism on the same level as Preaching—the ordinance of engrafting with the call to be engrafted; and (3) to those who are thus, by faith and baptism, engrafted into Christ, Teaching—a teaching mainly practical, concerned with the obedience required by the faith they had accepted, and the fruits of the life whereof they had become partakers—to "observe and do all things whatsoever I have commanded." It seemed to him that in this great text they had both the power and the mission of the Church, a mission world-wide in its range, to all nations, even as He is the only Saviour.

Rev. W. BROWNLIE, Lenzie, said their first duty was to help the people of Scotland to understand what was meant by "the Church." There was no use trying to preach to congregations or to the public at large on the vocation of the Church till they made up their minds as to what the Church was. There was nothing they needed to be delivered from more than false individualism. In Scotland they had personal caprice carried to such an extent as to ruin and wreck the conception of the Church till each man thought he was fit to be a church in himself, orders and everything included. They must teach the people of Scotland something as to the unity of a church where personal caprice shall have no life or right to live, but where there is personal life of the most noble sort. They

must teach the people not to forget everything they owed to the past, and that Scotland did not contain the whole of Christian faith, that it was bad for any man or church to cut himself off from the great stream of Christian faith which had existed in Europe for the last eighteen hundred years. Some people imagined there was no Church in Scotland till the Reformation. They knew its errors and what they were cut adrift from, but it was not a good thing to think there was no religious life in Scotland prior to that time. They must, therefore, teach the meaning of the Church. Mention the word sacerdotalism, and see how many people, to use a colloquialism, would positively get red-headed. Mention the word priestcraft, and see how many people would be up in rebellion. But the people of Scotland set up the clergy in the pulpit, and the clergy had to pray for them; they had to preach for them; and sometimes the people did not even take part in the praise. One might say that the people looked at public worship from an external point of view; they forced the clergy to be more of the priest than anybody even in the Roman Catholic or Anglican Church. When they had taught the people the meaning of the Church they would get what had been that day so splendidly insisted upon—the priesthood of all believers. If they did that they would hear no more of the false sacerdotalism they all disliked, which none preached or cared for. They did not want a priest coming between them and God; they wished every man to understand what was meant by membership, by the Church, her vocation, and his work as part of it.

Mr RANKINE said he did not know the previous speaker's name, but he must say that if the ministers of the Church were forced to preach and pray and sing for the congregations their people were very easily led. It pained him to think of the sadness which was in his mind when he had to stand dumb and was forced by the minister, or whoever was responsible for it, to stand dumb, and could not raise his voice. He had come simply to protest against the minister saying he was forced to preach and pray and

sing for the people. Would they allow him also to protest against the expense, in other words, luxuriousness and worldly pride, that was coming into their Church, and which was something awful? And yet there were poor heathen all over the world who could not get a £5 church built for their accommodation, and their foreign fund was thousands of pounds behind. He had gone to the Assembly with a minister belonging to a Cathedral Church in the North, and the minister told him how easily, greatly to his own surprise, he and his colleague within a few months got £10,000 to restore his Cathedral. He said that was a disgrace. Let them have churches by all means, but while the heathen were going on without a church or place of worship and were needing teachers, it was in God's sight a sin for them to spend £10,000 on one great building for the pride of the country. ("Oh!") Yes it was: and he believed they would hear it was so when the Master came.

Rev. Dr HUNTER, Galashiels, said that certain things had been said in the papers—admirable papers, and most instructive from various points of view—which put it on him that he owed a duty to one whom he counted it an honour to have as a friend, whose personality impressed him greatly, and whose name could not be mentioned without honour in the Church of Scotland for years to come—Dr John Macleod of Govan. No subject that was to be discussed in this Congress was of more interest to him than that of the vocation of the Church, and the point of view Dr Macleod would have approached it from was very much that of Professor Herkless—that they would never grapple with the subject of the vocation of the Church till they dealt with the proper training of the ministry. He agreed entirely with what Professor Herkless said, that at present they did not train their ministers properly, and that they could not expect the vocation of the ministry to be properly recognised till they did so. At this moment from the intellectual point of view they had hardly improved upon

what was done three hundred years ago. Their Divinity Halls were wretchedly furnished with subjects. The modern developments of theology but ill represented, and they did absolutely nothing in a formal way for the spiritual training of the ministry. The Church had not yet awakened to a sense of its duty in that respect, and if this Congress could impress this duty upon the Church, the question of the vocation of the Church and the efficiency of the ministry would be largely solved. He happened to be convener of the Assembly's Committee on Probationers. He had endeavoured over and over again to shape schemes for the better care of probationers, and he found that the Assembly always managed to put the consideration of the subject down late on the Saturday afternoon. The course of procedure by which their probationers realised their aims in entering on the ministry — *i.e.* by pursuing a most degrading system of canvassing — was unworthy of the Christian Church. Committees would be glad to get rid of the system, and speaking for an honourable body like probationers, he was sure they themselves would be glad to get rid of it.

Rev. Dr MARSHALL, Edinburgh, said he felt extremely grateful for the way that Professor Herkless referred to the scheme so dear to the heart of the late Dr John Macleod—that of the establishment of Theological Institutes. He wanted the members of the Congress to know that that subject, notwithstanding the removal of their beloved friend and leader, Dr Macleod, had not altogether been allowed to fall into abeyance. His brother, Dr Norman Macleod, at last Assembly took up the matter, and it would be brought before the Church before long. He was glad to hear Professor Herkless, whom nobody could accuse of introducing priestcraft or High Churchism into Scotland, speaking these kindly words. What he had said would interest the members of the Church, and he trusted the laity would come forward and that prayer of Dr John Macleod would be answered —that there would be generous giving by members of the

Church towards a movement which would help to supply the Church with more qualified and more spiritual teachers.

Rev. G. G. GILLAN, Carmunnock, said it appeared to him that they were drifting away from the leading title of their discussion and too much into details. The true vocation of the Christian Church was to be drawn from the Bible record of their Lord's life in the Gospels, the doings of the apostles in the Acts, and the discussions and exhortations of the apostles as the inspired commentators. He respectfully suggested that while they kept before them the great national objects of a National Church, they should keep before them also, as one very important part of the Church's work, the dealing with individuals. Great stress should be laid upon the personal element—the dealing with individuals. The ministry of reconciliation was the great vocation of the Church.

Rev. Dr SPROTT said the visible Church, which is the subject of discussion, consists of all who in Holy Baptism have been brought into covenant with God and consecrated to His service. Parts of this divine and supernatural society are in confusion and disorder, and those parts which retain the essentials of its primitive constitution, viz., an authorised ministry and the apostolic doctrine and worship, depart more or less from the divine plan in the way of excess or defect. Still the Church is the Body of the risen and glorified Redeemer, who is its source of life and head of authority. It is in a very special sense the Kingdom of God upon earth. Christ is King upon the holy hill of Zion, and His servants and subjects have but to administer His ordinances and to obey His laws. Our forefathers were deeply interested in this whole subject, however little attention may be paid to it nowadays. Professor Cooper has spoken of the vocation of the Church as contained in the commission given by our Lord to His apostles immediately before His Ascension. There is another text which sheds an additional light upon its vocation—that in which it is described as the pillar and

ground of the truth. The truth is the teaching of our Lord, and that teaching developed and completed by the apostles under the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit. That is the Faith once for all delivered to the saints, for which the Church has to bear witness, rejecting alike Roman additions and unbelieving negations. And the Church is not only called to be Christ's witness, but His representative, and the instrument by which He accomplishes His purposes of mercy towards mankind.

Rev. R. T. TARBET, Buittle, said that the great need felt by those standing more or less aloof from the Church was to have its creed interpreted for the present day. They all knew there were many men and women who were discontented with the present social state of matters—very many who wished what Christ said regarding these matters explained to them—who wanted interpreted to them what was the righteousness of Christ in regard to the state of matters at the present day, in regard to capital and labour, master and servant, and all these things. Was there such an interpretation of the righteousness of Christ at the present moment, and was it the vocation of the Church to interpret what was the eternal truth that came to the Church in the present state of matters? He thought all men and women generally should look to the Church for guidance.

Rev. Dr MAIR said he did not rise to continue the discussion, but to make a suggestion. He thought they should say nothing that reflected on the proceedings of the General Assembly. As this was the first meeting held by the Congress, he thought it was wise he should suggest this publicly. He only added that, as an old man, he was thankful to notice from the speaking of their young professors that they were leal and true and strong and good.

The MODERATOR entirely agreed with Dr Mair. He thought it was better that they should not reflect on the action of the General Assembly in the course of their discussions.

THE CHURCH: (*B*) ITS RELATION TO MODERN THOUGHT.

Papers.

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL STEWART, D.D.—As I have the honour of reading the introductory paper upon this important subject, I propose to deal with it in a general and comprehensive way and to aim at indicating what seem to me the lines on which any profitable discussion of it should run. I shall first enquire what is implied in the terms in which the subject is set down for discussion; then consider the elements of modern thought to which the Church's attention should be specially given; and finally indicate those elements of it which the Church may regard with satisfaction and hope.

I. "The Relation of the Church to Modern Thought"; what is implied in that? Clearly that Modern Thought is recognised as possessing an independence of the Church, is indeed shrewdly suspected of an antagonism to her. There seems further implied on the part of the Church a certain feeling that in respect of its contents or form, or both, her message belongs to an earlier age, is evidenced by considerations which may or may not stand the test to which modern methods of investigation would put them, and needs therefore to be defined, if not justified in presence of the new life which has risen up among us. The Church is not a part of Modern Thought as she is certainly not its product. Their relations have still to be defined; the past and the present still look one another questioningly in the face; the system of thought which is, or seems to be, bound up with Christianity, with its acceptance in any of its traditional forms, looks askance at the facts and methods of the science and philosophy of to-day; the great ecclesiastical institutions find themselves in contact with problems which at

the time of their inception were hardly dreamed of, in rivalry with forces which threaten to supersede and dethrone them. Are they to be friends or foes, to co-operate or struggle with each other? Is Modern Thought, are modern ways self-sufficient, or do they reveal a sense of need which what the Church possesses alone can satisfy? Has the Church anything to learn, anything to unlearn, in presence of this modern life, whereby her position may be confirmed or corrected, and her influence be made yet more powerful for good?

The time was when the Church was the guide of thought, all departments of human activity being subject to her control and enlisted in her service. It is a commonplace that, but for the Church, the lamp of knowledge might have been extinguished during the long period of the early Middle Ages. Beyond what was required for the practical needs of every-day life, which could be satisfied in the simplest and coarsest way, the only knowledge which seemed to men of the slightest use was that which the Church represented, about which her highest intellectual powers were exercised, — the problems of religion and theology. This was the ideal element which softened the rigours of the arts of war, and touched with a higher light such commercial, domestic and political relations as existed. The Church was the patron of the Arts, and at once stimulated and controlled enquiry and speculation. The scholars and thinkers of that time were almost of necessity ecclesiastics. Emancipation came, conflict arose, when the various departments of investigation passed into the hands of the laity. Art and science ceased to be ecclesiastically edited and controlled; they conducted the minds of men whither they would, and were no longer subordinated to foregone conclusions. It did not necessarily follow that these subjects would be pursued altogether out of sympathy with the Church and its aims. But the tendency was towards independence, and, in conformity with the general principles of human nature, even towards reaction. Hence it has

come to pass that knowledge, investigation, thought, are no longer under Church control; they have ends of their own to be independently pursued; and a system of thought has been built up which may or may not prove to be compatible with that which the Church has erected on the only intellectual foundations originally available. So the question sooner or later arises—it has emerged with special persistency in our day—Are the evidences of what may be called the Church's *Weltanschauung* subject to review according to the methods of ascertaining knowledge which are now deemed essential? If so, is it thereby modifiable either in substance or form? If its positive elements come into collision with results of investigation in other departments of human enquiry, by what criterion is their relation to be determined? Is the Church's teaching on such points to be tested by the evidence adducible, or must it be received on grounds to which no test is applicable? The latter claim would be suicidal. Certainly if there is one principle more than another which has claims to be considered fundamental it is that truth must be sought and that at any cost. The influence which the Church should exert upon all other departments of investigation should be before all to demand the uncompromising search after truth, and this principle should be emphasized by her own example. Too often through a short-sighted policy it has been given up or endangered; lines of investigation have been arrested or at least hampered by fear of the results to which they seemed to be leading; and this again has provoked the inevitable reaction, so that results inimical to the Church have been sought for and wrought for, often to the neglect of important counter-balancing considerations. It is in her wider view of things that the strength of the Church in relation to modern thought should lie. The danger of the latter is narrowness, one-sidedness,—the result of excessive specialisation. A true theology, on the other hand, rests on the ultimate conclusion to be drawn from all fields of knowledge; the ultimate choice is be-

tween two views of the world, the religious and the anti-religious; and the justification of the former is, and can only be, that it takes account of all the facts, not neglecting any, and draws from them the final inevitable inference.

Similarly, as guide of life, the Church finds herself divested of much of her ancient authority. She is no longer the dictator of men's actions, and that not only in the sense that forces are at work of which she necessarily disapproves, but much of what is consonant with her spirit, and in accordance with her aims, she finds cared for by agencies over which she exercises no direct control. Many of the problems of modern life also exceed in magnitude and complexity those in the face of which her formulas were devised. But just as in the field of thought it is her supreme interest as well as duty to seek and maintain the truth, so in the sphere of action her strength is to be the uncompromising advocate of righteousness and justice. To the canons of ethical perfection which she represents, all methods, all organisations, must be brought for final adjudication. So long as in this way she has the moulding of the public and private conscience, so long as her principles are at the root of the springing life around her, it matters nothing that plans are not of her dictation, and organisations not under her control. Let her inspire the efforts of men, preserving by her own peculiar methods and organisation the spirit which moves them, and she is still able to prove herself indispensable to the world, the salt which even unconsciously absorbed, is at once the conservator and the relish of life.

II. Such then being the general relation of the Church to modern thought, we may proceed to enquire what those elements of modern thought are which the Church should keep specially in view, the pulses on which she should lay her finger, if she would comprehend that thought, and her own relation and duty in regard to it.

The elements of difficulty, as we may call them, may be briefly indicated as follows:—

1. It seems a true instinct which has led the Church to watch carefully the development of the idea of the universal prevalence of law, using the term in the sense in which it is applied to physical phenomena. I am not now concerned with defending or combating this idea. It may be that further investigation will prove the absolute universality of law and its applicability to every sphere, but if so the Church's whole system of thought will be revolutionised. So far as we can see, this conception not only necessarily excludes that of the supernatural and of direct divine communication on which so much of positive religion has always rested, but if consistently carried out it invades the sphere of the moral and spiritual, and by enthroning necessity in the place of free choice, it makes the very conception of the moral, of the free relation of mind to mind, impossible. But the Church believes that God has spoken, that He is not separated from her and from the souls He has made by the whole round of physical causation, that "closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet," and so, while fully recognising the worth of the idea of natural law in its own sphere, she is on her guard against what may prove to be its illegitimate extension.

2. Not the least of the Church's dangers in the face of modern thought and life is the *secularisation*, the absorption in purely earthly aims to which the latter tends. We have seen how the various spheres of life became gradually emancipated from the Church's control. In their independence they wield an almost irresistible influence, both because they are many while the highest good is one, and because they are interesting and absorbing in view of the necessities and even the adornments of life. It is not necessarily that men *undervalue* religion and divine things, often they are simply thoughtless with regard to them. Business, ambition, pleasure, even the delights of knowledge and investigation leave no room for their cultivation. Amidst a life so determined by lower ideals, religion must

lift up her voice. Once again she must *reveal* the life of God to those on whose hearts the veil of ignorance is too willingly retained. Men need to be reminded that the things which are seen are temporal, the things which are eternal are among those which are not seen.

3. The tendencies just noted assail the Church and her mission in three chief forms—the scientific, the pantheistic, and the literary. The first of these is perhaps the most directly antagonistic. *Science*, through some of her representatives, claims it as her mission to supersede the Church. In a system built up of law and necessity there is no room for God, nor has it been found that the methods which science suggests for the guidance of life have been in practice too friendly to morality of the highest type. *Pantheism* is a phase of thought at present largely influential. It joins forces with science in its recognition of law, though differing from it in the interpretation of this idea. Hence it often seems to favour the religious view, to the language of which it makes a near approach, though when closely interrogated it is no less incompatible with that view than is the so-called scientific attitude. *Literature* presents its own difficulties, its own temptations. In so far as Christianity is founded upon a sacred literature it cannot refuse to be tried by the canons to which literature in general is subject; and as literature largely forms the intellectual atmosphere into which any intellectual or spiritual force must enter, the spirit of the literature of an epoch largely determines the manner in which that force will be received and assimilated. The play of imagination in literature, not less than the exactitudes of science, constitutes not necessarily a danger to be avoided, but an element of modern thought which the Church in the interest of that which is committed to her, cannot too closely scrutinise. In all these cases, it would seem that vigilance and a prompt and vigorous counter-criticism must be brought to bear by the Church upon the forces and influences concerned, that she may reject what

is untrue, evil, dangerous, while she discovers and assimilates the good.

III. That there is good, that there are hopeful signs, in the most modern phases of modern thought, can, I think, scarcely be disputed, and my last task is briefly to indicate where these appear to me to lie.

1. First, it is a great gain that modern thought busies itself about *forces* rather than *ideas*, not with abstract conceptions, still less with empty formulas, but with the living active powers which constitute the reality of things. There is a directness in modern vision which will not rest upon the surface, but penetrates to the core. "Come face to face with realities," is its message, "be not satisfied with words, even with appearances." Now religion is a sphere where words, professions, formulas, institutions, forms, and symbols, have been too often made to do duty for the realities they represent, or ought to represent. The modern spirit and method do not condemn the symbol, but they demand to be brought into the presence of the reality. Force, religious and other, makes itself felt, has effects, and proves thereby its existence, as mere ideas cannot do. And it is only by exhibiting the living force within her, animating her, that the Church can justify her existence. Whenever this power is absent, the coldly scrutinising eye of modern thought will find it out and expose it. It is well for the Church that she should be thus tested. It does not follow that religion is to become purely ethical, but it is certain that nothing which is thought only, which does not rest upon the rock of reality, can stand the test and be recognised as living and deserving of being defended and maintained.

2. Even in the element of agnosticism, which modern reflection proves to enter into all knowledge, we may perceive something which is not without affinity with, and may be regarded as only an exaggeration of, that sense of the mysterious, that element of infinity which enters into all true religion. The greatest thinkers, an Augustine as

well as a Plato, have recognised the ineffable, the inconceivable, in regard to God and divine things. The Church perhaps needs to recognise this element more explicitly than she has hitherto done, and transgresses by claiming a too great minuteness and precision of knowledge in regard to these things. The boldness of her affirmations has time and again brought her into trouble. She has set forth her inferences from the divine facts with the same assurance of being right as when setting forth the divine facts themselves. It would be better if she more frequently spoke the language of modesty and of reverence, admitting degrees of certainty, ever seeking to know more perfectly. She may well learn such an attitude from modern thought, and her adoption of it will not impair her hold upon that which constitutes her life, while it will free her from entanglement in the wreckage which now and then she has had, out of regard for her very safety, to cut adrift.

3. Such recognition of an element of agnosticism in all real religion does not, however, imply either that a reality must be denied because it is not comprehended, or that knowledge is not as far as it goes knowledge of reality. What is received on evidence will be held with a strength proportioned to that of the evidence on which it is received. And, as we have seen, modern thought leads us largely to recognition of forces rather than formulation of ideas, and a force is that of which we accept the reality, without deeming that we have exhausted its significance. We can only understand the force by means of its effect, and this can give us only partial, not exhaustive, knowledge regarding it. But even the partial knowledge is real knowledge, and may be made effective for practical ends.

4. What I have said implies the intense *earnestness* which characterises much of our modern thought and life which is yet independent of the Church, or remains outside her pale. This is nowhere more conspicuous than in the efforts made towards social amelioration which mark our time. With many philanthropy takes the

place of religion. Religion will make a fatal mistake if to any degree it allows itself to be out of touch with such efforts. Rather should the Church seek to take her place at the head of the movement, not indeed by attempting to dominate its immediate aims and methods —that would be a hopeless attempt — but by the strenuousness of her own effort, and by the inculcation of a spirit which those engaged in philanthropic enterprise shall recognise as in sympathy with their own, and at the same time as supplying a force by which their own efforts would be the better of being supplemented. If the Church believes herself to be possessed of the highest moral force, she dare not miss this opportunity; she must hail the existence of the social impulse, and allying herself with it extend her usefulness, and bring an added blessing to the world.

There are many things in the modern world for which the Church cannot be held responsible, unless negatively, and which are to be deplored; but with all that is highest and best in it, she should seek to place herself in relation, regarding it with watchfulness indeed, but with the freedom from suspicion and jealousy which can only come of a firm and rightly placed faith. After all, it, as well as the Church herself, is one of the many ways in which God reveals Himself, lest our good custom should corrupt the world. But in taking up her attitude towards it, the Church would do well to recall the attitude of the Apostle—"We are helpers of your joy, not seekers of dominion over your faith." Helper, not dictator—witness to that higher truth which is often hidden from the wise, and revealed unto the simple, to that wisdom before which the world's best wisdom is foolishness—so shall she win men unto Him who is the Truth, as well as the Way and the Life.

Mr J. H. Millar, Advocate.—The first consideration that probably occurs to anyone on approaching the question of the attitude of the Church towards modern thought is, that "modern thought" is not a coherent and consistent

whole. It is not one but manifold, not simple but complex; ranging over the whole of the wide field between an acrid and somewhat irritable materialism at the one extreme, and a relapse at the other, into some of the basest and most despicable forms of superstition which have ever darkened the human mind. It is quite plain that, even with the best will in the world to be receptive and hospitable, the Church cannot greet all the conflicting aspects of modern thought with an equally warm welcome. The hardiest of those adventurous spirits who seem to think that the Church's main business is to be "up to date," and to be perpetually adapting her teaching to the *dernier cri* of philosophy or science, might well shrink from the Sisyphean labour of annually accommodating that doctrine to the views of the Gifford lecturer for the time being. A minimum amount of stability, a minimum amount of dogma, will probably be acknowledged by all to be practically desirable if not logically defensible. We shall not, then, perhaps, be very far wrong if we lay down the general proposition that the attitude of the Church towards modern thought should be one of benevolent, but vigilant, scepticism.

There are one or two branches of enquiry especially prominent at the present day in regard to which benevolence may justly be permitted to predominate. Among these are archæology and anthropology. In dealing with those sciences, it is true, the churchman must be on his guard against the temptation to wrest their results to his own advantage. Such rashness is sure to bring severe punishment in its train. But if this risk be avoided, and if due care be taken to distinguish clearly between well-ascertained facts on the one hand, and the inferences deduced from them by experts on the other, there remains a large mass of material possessing extreme interest and importance for all who are concerned in maintaining the truth of the Christian revelation. There is another conspicuous branch of enquiry with regard to which the vigilance and jealousy

of our scepticism may legitimately be suffered to gain the upper hand. Of the amazing performances of the "higher criticism" this is not the place, nor am I the person, to give a detailed account. The unanimity with which its Teutonic exponents and their British satellites tear the books of the Bible to tatters is only equalled by the unanimity with which they deride one another's efforts to reconstruct what has been so unmercifully demolished. These commentators live and breathe in an atmosphere of preconception. Arbitrary assumption is a large part of their stock-in-trade; and *petitio principii* is the darling fallacy of their powerful minds. They would triumphantly demonstrate that so finished a masterpiece of composition as *Wandering Willie's Tale* could not possibly be the work of so notoriously careless a writer as Scott; and then they would begin to quarrel as to whether it ought more properly to be ascribed to Southey or to Bentham, to Byron or to Tom Moore, to John Wilson Croker or to John Gibson Lockhart. We may console ourselves by reflecting that precisely the same methods have been applied by the higher criticism to other ancient literatures. Moses and Isaiah have but participated in the treatment to which Homer was the first to be exposed. The work of destruction and reconstruction has been carried on in both cases with equal pertinacity, equal wrongheadedness, and equal indifference to the canons of true literary taste. That the verdict of most competent judges is now emphatically on the Conservative side as regards Homer can scarcely be disputed. It would be indeed strange if literature, invoked a quarter of a century ago to give the *coup de grâce* to dogma, should now turn out to have ranged herself on the other side.

There are, however, certain phases of modern thought, the attitude of the Church to which should be one not merely of curiosity or scepticism, but of unrelenting hostility. It is one thing to abandon positions of trivial consequence. Too much time has often been wasted in the easy task of "guarding the point no enemies attack." But

it is quite another matter to surrender the citadel at the very first moment of the assault. The Church, for example, can make no compromise with that pretentious scheme of speculation, self-styled the "synthetic philosophy," for the Church cannot come to terms with any system which treats man as a merely natural phenomenon, and which seeks to explain the fundamental conception of moral obligation by resolving it into elements with which its connection, at the best, is purely fortuitous. No doubt this gigantic scheme, with its parade of accuracy in detail as well as of comprehensiveness in principle, and with its ostentatious pretension to completeness and consistency, has a charm for some who have enjoyed a quasi-scientific education. It can present little or no attraction to those who have ever seriously pondered the problems of ethics, or have ever sought to analyse their mental and moral experience. It is an attempt to lend plausibility to rank utilitarianism by spreading the process of development over a vast tract of time, and nothing more.

The Church, in truth, has much less to fear from this quarter than from another, and at the first blush, far less obvious source of danger. One of the most insidious and perilous forms of error is that which, for convenience sake, may be called deism. In that term I comprehend those modes of thought which may differ in detail, but have for their common badge and characteristic the elimination of the supernatural and miraculous, both from the facts on which Christianity is based, and from the doctrines deducible therefrom. That objectionable element once eliminated, the mutilated remains of the body of doctrine are pieced together, and there ensues a spirited effort to make believe that here is the Christian religion in its pristine purity.

It would be vain to deny that there are natures neither ungenerous nor unintelligent to whom such a system makes a powerful appeal. Deism has about it an engaging, though deceptive, air of simplicity; and its apostles are endowed with uncommon solemnity and unction. Exaggerated symp-

toms of profound learning, if not of profound thought or severe ratiocination, appear in some of them. Above all, deism from the time of Mr Square until the present day has always had at command an inexhaustible fund of imposing phrases and benevolent sentiments. Phrases, however sonorous, and sentiments, however amiable, are unluckily of little avail to preserve religion in a state of thorough animation, though a man may take some time to make this discovery. The insecure and unsatisfactory basis on which deism rests is best perhaps discovered by a consideration of its attempts to solve the difficulties which beset Christianity, as they beset every form of religious or philosophical belief. The problem of Divine Providence, for example, in its relation to communities and individuals, is an inscrutable mystery. The Christian is content to accept the light which revelation affords, and which he will find reflected from history and from personal experience. He believes that as a father pitieth his children so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him; that not a sparrow falls to the ground without our Heavenly Father; and that the Being whom he worships and to whom he presents his requests is, literally and emphatically, the hearer and the answerer of prayer. In the view of the deist, such beliefs are unworthy of an enlightened understanding, savouring as they do of that deadliest of heresies, "anthropomorphism." In absolute bondage to the word "law," which is probably responsible for more loose thinking than any other word in the English language, he substitutes the hypothesis of immutable order in time for special interposition in time, and thinks that by so doing he has made everything plain and intelligible. As if the conceptions of law and order as applied to the actings of the Almighty were not to the full as "anthropomorphic" as those of a savage! To retort upon the deist in his own manner we might describe his deity as a species of enlightened monarch, who, with an almost pedantic respect

for certain constitutional principles of his own laying down, declines to interfere in the affairs of his subjects upon any pretext whatever. Yet those subjects are encouraged to address their ruler in the language of supplication in order, by this act of conscious self-deception, to produce certain changes in their emotions, their dispositions, or their will, if they have any. We remember the remark of Charles II. to his brother, "They will never kill me to make you king"; and we may be tolerably sure that, if the edifice of Christianity is ever destroyed, it will not be replaced by a system which confronts the intellect with obstacles at once more numerous and more formidable.

In dealing with deism the Church enjoys one great advantage, viz.: that the battle was fought and won a hundred and fifty years ago. The position of the deist to-day is, apart from a few details, indistinguishable from that of his predecessors in the eighteenth century. One feature is peculiarly noticeable as being common to both: the inability to perceive, or the reluctance to acknowledge, the consequences that flow from deistical principles. Surely it behoves us to be candid and to face the inevitable. Abolish the miraculous and the supernatural, and Christianity disappears. Something of great value may or may not remain; but the Christianity which has exercised and still exercises so powerful an influence over the world is gone beyond recall. The residuum is a number of valuable ethical maxims enunciated by a teacher of whom it is incontestably true that he solemnly claimed an authority for himself and his doctrine which, on deist principles, he had no warrant for doing. Perhaps it is some suspicion of this necessary result which makes so many deists nervously solicitous to be called Christians, and to obtain admission to an ordinance which, at the best, must be for them otiose, and at the worst an empty mockery.

Their favourite method of blinding themselves to the

conclusions to which their premises irresistibly lead is to employ the familiar language of Scripture, and particularly of the Epistles, in a sense which may or may not be legitimate, but is, at all events, plainly neither the sense in which it was originally employed, nor that which is sanctioned by tradition. And here the Church may take warning from their example. The vocabulary and phraseology of science should be used very sparingly indeed, even by way of metaphor, in expounding Christian doctrine. Words like "environment" are apt to have a misleading connotation. If we are wise we shall not attempt, as some have done, to defend miracles by describing them as a "manifestation of a higher law" than the ordinary laws of nature. This is to explain *ignotum per ignotius*, and to ignore the fact that the whole point of a miracle lies in its being an interruption of a long and unvarying series of observed uniformities. Above all, let us avoid the great and unpardonable mistake of endeavouring to state the truths of the Gospel in terms of physical science. As well attempt to state them in terms of algebra! The result is invariably a compound of dubious science and bad Christianity. This city was at one time the headquarters of this species of theological quackery. But the manufacture of the objectionable nostrum appears in the meanwhile to be conducted on a somewhat smaller scale than of yore.

After all, the Church has suffered infinitely less from the attacks of certain forms of modern thought than from the daily walk and conversation of those "professors" and high-flyers who, ever since the Reformation, have been its peculiar curse in this quarter of the world. No topic is more unsuited for ordinary pulpit treatment than apologetics except casuistry; and the preacher who does his duty will not find it necessary to confute many real or imaginary unbelievers. It is a delusion to suppose that the laity are anxious to hear those subjects discussed on Sunday which they read of in the newspapers and the magazines during the week. The spectacle of their minis-

ter coquetting with unbelief is by no means grateful to them; they have not come to church to hear anybody expatiate on the marvels of science; and they would be relieved if a little of the lofty eloquence sometimes expended upon the beauties of nature were diverted to the theme of the beauties of divine grace. The fall of man; the barrier interposed between man and his Creator by sin; the life, the death, the resurrection, and the ascension of the Divine Redeemer; the scheme of redemption and its nice adaptation to the needs and aspirations of the human heart; the divine commission of the Church; the significance and efficacy of the sacraments (so admirably and clearly set forth, if I may venture to say so, in the standards of the Church of Scotland),—these, surely, are matters not easily exhausted, and calculated to arouse the highest and best energies even of such as lack the gift of mere oratory. Now we see through a glass darkly, but *then* face to face; and the minister who has consistently preached those vital truths of the faith, and illustrated them by a corresponding life, may look forward with humble confidence to the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed, when the mysteries of the universe shall be unfolded, and when we shall know even as also we are known.

Speakers.

Professor Patrick.—When one is invited to speak for ten minutes on such a topic as this, he may take it for granted that the aim of his contribution to the discussion is not academic but practical. Modern thought, so far as it is hostile to the Church or out of sympathy with it, is in part anti-Christian, in part non-Christian. In some respects the latter phase of thought is more dangerous than the former. To assume that any institution is effete is more fatal to it than direct attack upon it; the attack is, at least, a tribute to its vitality. I remark, to begin with, that the Church must take cognisance of modern thought. Aloofness is an im-

possible attitude, and would be foolish even were it possible. The conflict is not to be solved by ignoring its existence. The Church cannot stand aloof even in self-defence; it dare not do so without the risk of being starved or submerged or stranded; it ought not to do so, because a Christianity which admitted that any sphere of human thought, any department of human activity, was not within its province or of no interest to it, would soon cease to be an operative force in the life of men. If isolation be thus impossible, what is to be the attitude of the Church? The opposite extremes of surrender and suppression may be set aside. To surrender—unless it be some broken-down outwork which stands in no real relation to the citadel of the truth—were madness; to seek to suppress would be an insult to Christianity itself. "The prophet that hath a dream" must be allowed to "tell his dream." He is no wise defender of the truth of Christ who speaks as if its only chance of continued existence lay in its complete immunity from external assault.

In regard to the manifold diversity of modern thought I would say that the Church should not confound in one general condemnation the various forms of unchristian thought or scepticism, and should not regard any movement with suspicion unless it be in direct conflict with its own foundation. That aspect of thought, for example, which presents to the soul crying out for the living God an unknown God of whom we can predicate nothing, and with whom we can hold no fellowship, is hardly less paralyzing to the religious life than the direct denial of His existence; for it takes God out of life as a living power by representing Him as One who will not or cannot manifest Himself. And with that type of teaching the Church can have no compromise. But to confound the scepticism which springs from irreverence, from sheer intellectual wantonness, with that which springs from a genuine if one-sided zeal for truth—to look with jealousy on some field of inquiry which seeks to exhibit a different side of the truth of God, is a mistake even in

point of policy, and is condemned by the teaching of history. For the lesson of history is that many a movement that seemed to be hostile has brought new life into the Church by compelling it to examine its title-deeds, and enabling it better to understand the nature of the treasures committed to its charge, and thus to fulfil better its God-given function in the world.

I venture to say further, that the Church should not be in too great a hurry in putting its thought into evolutionary moulds. Analogy is more useful by way of illustration than of demonstration. From the unity of the universe one is inclined *a priori* to suppose that the principle of evolution must be universal in its operation; but in its application to the spiritual sphere it may be assumed that it will be modified by the materials with which it is concerned; and that modification may be of such a nature as to render fruitless all attempts to put Christian thought into modern scientific categories.

My last suggestion is that the Church should emphasize its own distinctive sphere as the only agency which aims directly at the spiritual transformation of men. That sphere it alone occupies; and there its methods can alone be adopted. Other forms of thought may make it easier or harder for the Church to fulfil its ideal, but they can be no substitute for it. So far as it is irreligious modern thought solves spiritual problems by denying their existence; so far as it is religious, and not Christian, it often mistakes "the tender grace of a day" that is dying, for the dawn of a new day, and laying hold of fragments of Christian truth, exalts them into first principles. What is true in the worship of the Unknowable is ours, for we, too, worship a God who can never be fully known by man; what is true in the worship of art is ours, for we, too, worship an Ideal by the contemplation of whose beauty we are transformed; what is true in the worship of nature is ours, for we, too, worship One who is in nature, though not of it, whose

glory the heavens declare. I believe that it could be shown that the Christian ideal of thought and life is consistent with all thought and life worthy of true manhood; that the Gospel of Christ is not a narrowing but an expanding power; that to reject it in favour of any modern system of belief or unbelief will not enrich but impoverish the intellectual life; that, in brief, the realm of Christian thought is infinitely vaster and richer than any other. If we fail to establish this, the fault lies not in the Christian truth which we present, but in our erroneous or defective presentation of it. To tremble for the ark of Israel is sometimes natural; to be always trembling is to be disloyal to the Head of the Church and His assurance of the ultimate triumph of the kingdom which He came to establish.

Professor CLELAND, M.D., said it seemed to him they would get into a false position if they judged modern thought without recognising very distinctly what modern thought was. With reference to Mr Millar's paper, he remarked that science must be scientifically examined, and that whole departments of science were not to be got rid of by indulgence in flippant remarks. He thought he was latitudinarian enough, but he could not quite go so far as the very orthodox Principal Stewart went when he spoke in such a tolerant way of agnosticism. For his part he could not see how it was possible to be an agnostic and belong to the Church; were he an agnostic he should follow the founder of the word "Agnosticism" and belong to none. One of the great advantages of a National Church was that it afforded the best guarantee for freedom of thought; but he thought such freedom was cramped in a way which did the Church enormous harm by the subscription required from the clergy. There was no Confession of Faith nor any foundation whatever for subscription to one to be found in the Order Book—the Bible—and it would be better for the Church to adhere to the means laid down there for the welfare of the Church,

namely, prayer and spiritual life. He deprecated asking a young man whose time had been largely taken up with preparation for examinations to sign adhesion to a number of complex dogmas, and reminded them that the proper time for metaphysics was in later life when a large stock of experience and prudence had been laid in.

Discussion.

Mr A. S. Morris said that if there was one feature of their proceedings that had afforded him more pleasure than another, it was the admirable way in which two widely varying topics of thought had been so ably handled. There was, however, one speech by a layman, which they heartily and warmly applauded, upon which he had some remarks to make. He repudiated it altogether as a fair expression of the educated laity, and he was encouraged all the more by the straight and vigorous remarks by Professor Patrick. In his opinion, law was not a force that was to bind the God who was working it; it was just another word for order. He thought, in that connection, it was dangerous to use such an expression as Dr Stewart had done.

Rev. George Marjoribanks, Stenton, said they heard a good deal in these days as to the power of the pulpit, and even the influence of the clergy not being what it once was. He could not but think that such a high-toned discussion as that in which they were engaged would have a tendency to put the popular mind in a condition for seeing this question from the proper standpoint. They all knew there was a type of power, especially ecclesiastical power, which might rest, and had rested, on comparative ignorance and not a little superstition, and they had not to go far back in the history of the Church to see that, at least to a certain extent, the comparative monopoly of erudition in the pulpit accounted for the *ipse dixit* of the clergy going so far. Nowadays, when there was so much more quickening of

the intelligence in the pew, they would come to see that, although there might be now a somewhat different kind of power exercised by the clergy and the pulpit, it was much higher than ever it was in days gone by. He was sure they all felt that they were not resting simply on tradition, but by welcoming thoughtful working-men to their discussions they were bringing the public mind to see their proper standpoint; so, though the power of the pulpit might not be what it was, it was a much higher power, and there was a far greater future before the pulpit than there had been in the past. The Church was the last institution that ought to be envious or jealous of this quickening of thought in the pew.

The Moderator then thanked the readers of papers and those who had taken part in the discussion, and the Congress adjourned till the following day.

PUBLIC MEETING.

ST ANDREW'S HALL, 8 P.M.

The Lord Provost in the Chair.

The proceedings were opened with praise.

The Rev. P. M'ADAM MUIR, D.D., offered prayer.

THE HON. THE LORD PROVOST, said :—Ladies and Gentlemen,—We are met to-night to discuss the question of the attitude of the Church to social and economic movements, and perhaps you will allow me, at the outset, to express the pleasure which it gives me to preside over this magnificent audience.

I had the honour last evening, in the City Chambers, of welcoming to Glasgow the members of the Congress, of which this meeting forms a part, and, in supplement to what I then took the opportunity of stating, I suppose I am right in assuming that one of the objects which the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had in resolving to hold their Congress here was, to strengthen the hold which the Churches have on the population of this city, and at the same time to bring their work prominently under the notice of all classes of the people. That being so, it seems to me to be appropriate that prominence should have been given in the programme to such a subject as that which we are met to consider.

We are all aware that the primary duty of the Christian Church is to minister to the religious and moral requirements of the community, and in that connection I would venture to commend the action of the Assembly in promoting their Church Extension Scheme.

As an employer of labour, and as the head of this municipality, I am in a position to know that the prosper-

ous state of the trade of the country, which has been enjoyed for some time, is responsible for the great increase, during recent years, in the population of the city, and that that increase consists very largely of persons who have migrated from the country districts surrounding Glasgow to the city. It, therefore, follows that if the Churches are to cope with this accession to the population additional places of worship must be provided, and I am happy to say that in this regard the Church of Scotland, as well as the other Presbyterian Churches, have discharged their duty nobly.

While then, the Church has a distinct and definite function to perform, there are other spheres of activity of which it cannot afford to be ignorant, and in connection with which it is its bounden duty that it should not occupy neutral ground.

Of late years the scope of modern, social and economic problems has been very considerably extended, and, while it may be left to those specially charged with the working out of these problems to develop their particular propaganda as they may think best, it is, in my opinion, the legitimate province of the Church to see that the various social and economic movements do not usurp, but are subservient to, the claims of Christian agencies.

I am free to admit that the subject before us is a very wide one, but on that account I am sure we will be all the more certain to have, from the learned gentlemen who are to lead the discussion, a comprehensive treatment of it.

I have already stated that the primary purpose of the Church is to attend to the spiritual requirements of the people; but after they have done this, there is still to be considered the moral and social aspect of the question, and it is here that corporations and associations of individuals can materially assist. We can safely leave the clergy to do all that is required in the direction of expounding the Scriptures, and if the lay portion of the community, either in their collective or individual capacity, appreciates its

responsibilities, and performs its share of the work involved, then we may hope that the conditions of society will be vastly improved, and the lot of individuals materially benefited.

I am prepared to say that, so far as the Corporation of Glasgow is concerned, they have not been oblivious to their responsibilities in the directions to which I have alluded.

In the remarks which I addressed to the members of the Congress last night, I made reference to the City Improvements Department, which has been the means of clearing away numerous blocks of insanitary tenements, and converting what were formerly centres of disease and crime into comfortable and commodious dwelling-houses for the poorer classes, equipped with all modern sanitary appliances.

In other directions, also, the Corporation have not been slow to recognise their obligations to cater for the varied wants of a large population. They have provided public parks and recreation grounds, art galleries and museums, winter gardens and conservatories, baths and wash-houses, lodging-houses, family homes and people's palaces; and, indeed, everything which conduces towards the betterment of the social condition of those by whom they are elected.

In the matter of healthy entertainments and amusements likewise, the Corporation have not been wanting. The band performances in the parks during the summer, and the Saturday afternoon musical recitals in the various halls during the winter, have for their object the gratification of the legitimate and rational desires of the community in these directions.

In the olden days the duty of Town Councils was supposed to be confined to the providing for the cleansing of the streets, and the protection of the property of the lieges; but, within the last century, great strides have been made in the apprehension of their obligations towards their constituents.

I am not here, however, to eulogise the work of the Corporation of Glasgow, or to parade its various good

qualities, but I have only instanced a few of the directions in which they have endeavoured to meet the requirements of the community ; and that leads me to say that, while we, as a Corporation, have not stood still in the matters to which I have referred, the public are entitled to look to the Church also for progression. We now believe that the Church has a duty to interest itself in many things which concern the every-day life of the people, but which, in former days, were regarded as outwith its purview.

I think it is relevant to the subject in hand to say that the Church can, in a great measure, assist the Municipality, and conversely the Municipality can, in a peculiar degree, assist the Church, and, if they work hand in hand, the ultimate effect will be of the most lasting benefit to the whole body of the people.

I do not intend further to stand between you and the reverend gentlemen who are to speak, and I now beg to call upon Professor Flint to introduce the subject of "The Attitude of the Church to Social and Economic Movements."

Rev. Professor Flint, D.D.—The question which I have to deal with is, What ought to be the attitude of the Church towards social and economic movements? Of course, in the short time at my disposal, I can only deal with it in a very general way.

In order to answer it we must ask another question, What has the Church been constituted and appointed for? What is the great purpose or chief end of its existence on earth? The answer to that question must determine what should be the answer to the question which I have to consider here.

Now, there is no question which has received a clearer and a fuller answer in God's word than that. The term "Church," indeed, is far from being an unambiguous one, but none of the ambiguities in its use affect the answer which ought to be given to the question as to the end or purpose of the Church. For, whether by the Church be meant the Visible or the Invisible Church, the Church

universal or particular, the Church in its totality or in its sections, or, in other words, whether by the Church be meant the whole body of the redeemed, or the whole number of avowed Christians, or any Christian denomination, or a single congregation, however small, the chief end of the Church in all these senses is one and the same; and that end is no other than to build up and extend the Kingdom of God.

The idea of a Kingdom of God did not originate in special revelation. It was not confined in the Oriental world to Israel. Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia very notably, India, and China, all passed under a theocratic régime. Theocracy almost everywhere preceded monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, as a form of government. And in a way it deserved to do so; for it rested on a deeper and truer idea than those on which they are founded. The will which ought to rule on earth is *not* the will of one man, or of any class of men, or of any number of men, but the will of God. Vaguely even the most ancient nations of the earth felt this, and showed thereby that a Kingdom of God was their desire. If nations now forget this so much the worse for themselves. If they believe that they can rule and save themselves they will find that they can only misrule and ruin themselves. The true course for humanity to follow is not one which carries it away from theocracy in its general and essential essence of the rule or government of God, but one which carries it only from a partial towards a perfect theocracy; from an external semblance of theocracy to its spiritual reality; from a kingdom in which God is misrepresented by men who make use of His name to one in which God really rules through the power of His spirit working in the hearts and lives of men obedience to His own righteous laws.

The Kingdom of God was the underlying and unifying idea both in the Old Testament and in the New. What differentiates the Old Testament representation of it from those in the Scriptures or Sacred Texts of the Ethnic

religions is that it rested on a far truer and worthier view of God, a distinctly monotheistic and also thoroughly spiritual conception of His character, and a profound sense of His moral relations towards His people and towards mankind, in which were rooted the Messianic hope and the ideal of the Messianic kingdom. Christ came "preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom." The Kingdom was the burden and tenor of His teaching. The idea of it which He set forth was comprehensive of His entire doctrine and life. All that He said related to its conditions, laws, government, service, antecedents, or consequences. All that He suffered and did was with a view to its foundation and diffusion.

St John, St Paul, St Peter, and the other writers of the New Testament have more fully evolved and applied certain principles and precepts of that revelation of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God made by Christ and transmitted to us by the first three evangelists, but they have not essentially added to it, and still less in any way contradicted it; nor will, I believe, human criticism and speculation ever find that they can substantially either correct or transcend it.

The Church exists, then, for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. And, as was most fitting, in order that the Church might be able to do her duty and fulfil her mission in the world, the nature of the Kingdom of God has been revealed to her, especially by her blessed Lord Himself, with incomparable clearness, comprehensiveness, and attractiveness. He gave, indeed, no formal definition of it, yet He may be said to have virtually defined it by the position which He gave to it in the prayer which He taught His disciples as the model of prayer. In that prayer the petition "Thy Kingdom come" is preceded by the petition "Hallowed be Thy name," so that we may know that in the measure that God is revered in all the manifestations of His character, His Kingdom comes; and it is followed by the petition, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," so that we may know that the coming of God's kingdom on earth is just the doing of His will on

earth in the spirit in which it is done in heaven—the spirit in which it has been fully done on earth only by Christ Himself.

The Kingdom is not to be identified with the Church. Such identification is confusion. The Kingdom is far more comprehensive than the Church. The Church exists for the sake of the Kingdom, and is included in the Kingdom so far, and only so far, as it is filled with the spirit and obedient to the laws of the Kingdom. But the Church is essentially an instrument, and one instrument among many; whereas the Kingdom is an end, and the greatest and most comprehensive of ends, the one which includes all true spiritual, social, and economic ends. The Kingdom of God is the sphere of progressive and final redemption from evil, in which the divine love and the divine righteousness will ever increasingly, until at length completely, find their due response and realisation, and also the only proper goal of all creation and history, and of all human life and activity.

If, however, what I have just said be true, this also, it seems to me, must be true. The Church has had clearly revealed to her in broad and definite outlines, although not in details, the only true and comprehensive solution of the social question. And from that of itself it immediately follows that she has a social mission of immense importance in the world, and cannot, without plain violation of duty, feel indifferent to, or stand wholly aloof from, any social movements, for they all tend either to promote or retard the advance of the Kingdom of God, and in so far as they do either the one or the other, call either for her co-operation or her opposition. Her responsibility in this connection is all the greater, because the solution of the social problem revealed to her is not merely one solution among many, but is *the solution*, the one which excludes nothing that is true, and includes nothing that is false, in other solutions which have been proposed.

The social problem Karl Marx declared to be "a question of the belly," and a very eminent man, the late Archbishop

Ketteler of Maintz, "a question of the stomach," a coincidence of expression which called forth from a French writer the remark that the Archbishop's definition might be anatomically the more exact, but did not seem to be otherwise any improvement. What I object to is not the phraseology employed either by the Radical socialist or the Catholic socialist, but the inadequacy of the idea expressed by it. Man is not only belly and stomach, and does not live only by what will fill them. He does not live by bread alone. The poverty which causes any class of society to be insufficiently fed is a sore evil, and as it is always largely remediable, society should do its best to remove it. But it is not the only social evil, nor the deepest root of social evil. Wealth is the cause or occasion of as much social evil as poverty. Among the rich there are, perhaps, in proportion to their total number, more of them who are a danger, a disgrace, and a curse to society, than there are among the poor. Had every person in Glasgow ten thousand a year, I doubt if the social problem would be any nearer solution than it is, or if the work of the magistracy would be any lighter or the need for the police any less. Mere money can supply food enough, and a great deal more drink than is required, but it will never solve the social question.

Many have recently told us that the social problem is "a workman's question," "a question of wages," "the question of employment and its reward," and that its solution will be "the victory of the fourth estate" and "the organisation of society in the interest of manual labourers." Well, I certainly do not regret that this view should have been prominently brought forward and pressed upon public attention. We cannot realise too clearly the value, the honourableness, and the rights of manual labour; and many among us should sympathise more than we do with workmen in their struggles for better wages. No good workmen, let us remember, are *merely manual labourers*, but men who put their intelligence, conscience, and heart as well as

their physical energy into their work,—men whom it is gross injustice to speak of, or even to think of, as "mere hands,"—and who are well entitled to get from the capitalist as good terms as he can prudently give them. It seems to me very erroneous, however, to believe that the solution of the social problem can be the victory of the fourth estate, or that it is a mere wages question. It can be the victory neither of the fourth nor of any other estate, but victory over the evil that is in all estates and in their relations to one another—a solution that will apply to society as a whole and be for its welfare as a whole. Nor can it be a mere wages question. All intelligent workmen know that wages cannot be raised at will, and underneath their struggles for better wages there is generally a recognition of this fact, a desire merely for fair wages, for righteousness in regard to the share of remuneration due to labour, a desire morally legitimate and commendable even although it may at times be accompanied by vague and confused ideas of what fairness and righteousness are in given circumstances. Nor can the solution of the social problem be a mere wages question. Everyone knows that workmen may have high wages, and yet neither they themselves as a class nor society as a whole be the better on that account. The value of high wages depends chiefly on how they are spent, and as to the character of the spending of them moral qualities have always a great deal to do.

"The social problem is an economic question" is an answer still more frequently given than the one just noticed. Put the economic conditions of society right, we are told, and all will be right. Those, however, who attempt a reasoned justification of that answer base it on a materialistic philosophy which itself needs to be proved, and on a so-called "economic interpretation of history" which is contradicted by historical facts. We never can put the economic conditions of society right so long as its intellectual, moral, and social conditions are seriously wrong.

A German professor has written a book to prove that "the social problem is a moral question," and that has led another author to write a book to prove that "the moral problem is a social one." We may safely grant both to be partly right, and safely deny either to be wholly right. Society is dependent for its very existence, and still more for its prosperity, on morality, and morality can only be developed and exercised in society; but all true laws both of morality and of society, all laws conformity to which is the measure of moral and social progress, are laws of God, and if God be not revered and loved they will not be carefully and efficiently obeyed.

If you read a report of the speeches made at an educational congress you will probably find that someone has affirmed "the social problem" to be an *educational* one. And certainly all really important educational questions have an important bearing on the welfare of society; but by education would require to be meant something far more comprehensive and profound than formal teaching of any kind, and a discipline not of individuals only but of communities and nations—a discipline co-extensive with the working of Divine Providence through all its agencies towards its highest end—before it can be even plausibly asserted to be *the key* to the solution of the social problem.

In a congress of the clergy it would surprise no one to hear it said that the solution of the social problem must be a religious one, but that too would be a one-sided answer, and very apt to mislead. The social problem *is* a religious one, but it is also an economic, political, moral, and educational one; by no means merely a religious one, but inclusive also of all secular agencies, institutions, and movements.

Gambetta, in a celebrated oration, declared: "There is no social problem. There are only social problems." He was to a considerable extent right. There is no one social problem which you can take up and say, *that problem* solved, the whole social problem will be solved. There are many social questions, and each of them ought to receive a

specific answer. So far Gambetta was right. Yet there was a great defect in his statement. He overlooked that however numerous social questions may be, they are all connected, all so related to and dependent on others, that they cannot be satisfactorily treated as if they were wholly independent and apart. *The social question* is a vast complex of questions yet it is a complex unity, and it is so because society itself is a complex unity, a vast organic whole of more or less dissimilar parts. Social problems cannot be solved without reference to one another, because society itself, as St Paul so clearly realised, does not consist of disconnected individuals, but is, like the human body, a whole composed of many members and functions intimately conjoined and wisely co-ordinated with reference to a common end.

The significance of social unity is probably better realised to-day than it ever was in the past. The truth implied in that unity is the corner-stone of what is called Sociology, a study which is now attracting throughout the civilised world more attention to itself and exciting a keener interest than any other. None of those partial, one-sided views of the solution of the social problem to which I have referred can be expected to justify themselves at the bar of a sociology in the least degree entitled to be considered scientific. But the Christian answer, — Christ's own answer,—"Strive in all ways that God's kingdom may ever increasingly come in all directions," cannot possibly be found to be in conflict with a true sociology, even the most developed; nay, must be found to have anticipated all that is of highest directly practical value in the teaching of such a sociology. The Christian solution of the social problem fully recognises both the complexity and the unity alike of human nature and of human societies, all the variety of human wants and interests; and its remedy for the ills, material and spiritual, to which individuals, communities, and the race are subject, is alone all-inclusive.

The Kingdom of God being thus comprehensive the attitude of the Church to all movements for the amelioration of man's lot on earth should correspond to it. Nothing that advances the progress of the kingdom should be indifferent to the Church. The sympathies of the Church should be, if possible, as broad as the demands and appeals of the kingdom. Were it so—were the members of the Church thus sympathetic — were they sincerely interested in whatever makes for the bodily welfare, or intellectual enlightenment, or moral improvement, or spiritual progress, of their fellow-men, their collective influence for good could not fail to be enormous, and to make itself strongly felt in all the spheres alike of private and of public life. Were such large-mindedness, such large-heartedness, of spirit to pervade the congregations of our land, the Kingdom of God would assuredly make a wonderful advance in it and also beyond it. It is for the clergy to do what they can to bring this about, and to succeed they must exemplify in their own lives the spirit which they would elicit in others.

While the Church, however, should give her sympathy and encouragement to all movements which tend to the good of mankind and the advancement of the Kingdom of God on earth, it does not follow that she should herself directly conduct, or even largely intervene in the direct control of all those movements. In order to take up a right attitude towards them she must know what her own proper sphere is, and be content when she knows it to keep within it. She must in this respect cultivate humility and self-restraint. She must not underestimate what is called secular nor overestimate what is called ecclesiastical. She must not seek to arrogate exclusively to herself rights which belong as much or more to other agencies or to encroach on spheres of work or duty not her own.

The Church is not the Kingdom of God, although a part of it so far as she is ruled by the Spirit and obedient to the laws of God, but she has often claimed to be iden-

tical with it, and acted on that assumption. St Augustine advocated the view with all his eloquence. The Church of the Middle Ages, influenced by his teaching and still more by the circumstances in which she was placed, strenuously endeavoured to have her authority recognised as supreme over all secular powers even the highest. For a short time she seemed to have succeeded, but soon she found that her apparent victory was a real disaster, that her spiritual strength was gone from her, that she had materialised and debased herself, forced earnest spirits into revolt, and gathered wealth for the enrichment of greedy kings, princes, and nobles. In Geneva Calvin would not allow the magistracy to control the actions of the Church in any way but he extended the sway of the Church, as represented by himself and his consistory, over the entire lives of all classes of the citizens without regard to the rights of individual conscience or to civil liberties. Our own Reformers and Covenanters meant by those Crown rights of Christ over Scotland, for which they so heroically struggled, an immense deal more, and something very different, from the spiritual independence of the Church as understood in the nineteenth century.

But the course of modern history as a whole has been manifestly in another direction. The decisions of the Church are no longer as they were in the Middle Ages laws binding on all. One form of human activity, one social institution, after another, has separated from it, asserted its independence, and made good the assertion. The State has become laic, not ecclesiastical. Literature and science have broken away from all ecclesiastical control and guidance. Not long ago the parish ministers of Scotland, their elders, and their heritors, had almost the entire administration of its local affairs in their hands, and, perhaps, their chief deterrent from maladministration was the dread of ecclesiastical censures. Now the whole land is covered with a net-work of administrative bodies composed of members elected without reference to their religious

opinions, and responsible for their doings only to the civil power.

Has the Church any reason to regret the change? I answer in the negative, and with the most entire conviction. These new agencies are not irreligious or unchristian because they are non-ecclesiastical. Although disjoined from the Church they are not excluded from the Kingdom of God, and may accomplish work which will greatly promote its progress. So far as they do so they are necessarily auxiliary to the Church. It is an error to suppose that they need lessen, or are likely to lessen, the influence of the Church for good. They really afford larger opportunities for usefulness to the Christian men, and Christian women also, who have the appropriate gifts for service in connection with them. Wherever a clergyman has such gifts, and is careful to exercise them in a prudent, liberal-minded, Christian spirit, his influence in his parish will only be increased by being on a school board or parish council. And if he has not those gifts he need not be on them, but can make use elsewhere of such gifts as he has.

The Church has a special work assigned her, and to perform that work faithfully and earnestly is the chief way in which she can benefit the world. That work is not the direct and immediate control of any of the powers of society, but the indirect and mediate guidance of them all, through the quickening and sanctifying of society in all its elements, agencies, and relations, by bringing to bear on them as far as she can the full power of the pure and unmutilated Gospel. The Church may not lay its commands on other institutions as if she alone among them belonged to the Kingdom of God, and alone worked the works of God, but rather has she to stir them up to feel that by right, if not in fact, they belong as much to the Kingdom of God as herself, that thus awakening them to a sense of their high vocation they may walk worthy of it.

To persuade men heartily to receive the Gospel of the Kingdom and to act on it faithfully in every relationship

is the distinctive work of the Church, and it is one so indispensable and important that she is bound not to desert or neglect it for any other. She cannot be expected, therefore, in her corporate capacity to participate in all works or movements that tend to the happiness and elevation of man; nor will the clergy as her teachers and pastors gain but lose in spiritual influence if they do not make the ministry of the word and the care of their own flocks their principal concern. But while that must be borne in mind, it must also be remembered that the ministry of the word should as regards the clergy include practice as well as preaching, practice being the most eloquent and effective preaching, and that as regards the laity what has to be desired is not that they should be hearers of the word only, deceiving their ownselves, but doers of it, who alone are blessed by the hearing of it.

Further, "the Word" entrusted to the Church to proclaim and enforce is one not meant for the Church merely but for society as a whole. Although it fully recognises the importance of individuals, it has not been sent simply for the salvation of individual souls. It has been sent also for the redemption of our race and the establishment of a reign of divine righteousness and brotherly love on earth. The Bible, in which the "word" is contained, abounds in references to social and economic matters. It tells us of rich and poor, of employers and employed, of trade and taxation and the evils connected with them, of the deceitfulness, use, and abuse of wealth, of the domestic and civil relationships of life, of citizenship and its duties, of chastity, of honesty, of charity, of self-sacrifice, and the like, and of all the essential laws and principles on which social welfare depends. Any "preaching of the word" which ignores these things or fails to present them in the light of the Gospel cannot justly claim to be biblical, and is sure to be very insufficient for week-day guidance, and for the reproof and instruction in righteousness which the age requires.

The social and economic movements going on around

us are numerous, and of many kinds, and, of course, the attitude of the Church towards them must vary in accordance with their natures. The duty of the Church towards some of them is very obvious. Towards others of them there may well be much difficulty and difference of opinion in determining what the path of its duty really is.

There are the movements which aim directly at lessening destitution, alleviating suffering, healing diseases, saving life, rescuing the fallen, and so on; the movements which have originated the various benevolent and charitable institutions so numerous in cities like Edinburgh and Glasgow. The Church can be in no doubt as to her duty towards such movements and institutions. Alike the example and the teaching of her Lord must make such doubt impossible to her. She has always largely recognised the obligations of charity. The early and the mediæval Church both abounded richly in works of love and mercy towards the poor, the weak, the sick, the enslaved, and wronged. Wherein they erred, perhaps, was in interpreting too literally Christ's precepts as to almsgiving. Certainly under the social conditions of modern life almsgiving may easily be overdone. Hence charity in modern times rightly expresses itself to a great extent in other and safer forms. With very few exceptions the benevolent and charitable institutions of Edinburgh are creations of the Christian charity of the nineteenth century. I have no doubt that the same remark will be found to apply to Glasgow. I entirely believe that the clergy especially of our large towns greatly appreciate the value of the institutions to which I refer, but I fear that not a few even of them fail to do justice to their own sense thereof. Do they let their congregations know their value? Why should a minister only appeal to the charitable feelings of his people when he has a collection to make for the schemes of the Church? And would the schemes of the Church suffer were he once or even twice in the year to speak of other schemes, perhaps just as good and just as

Christian, although he was not going to make a collection for them? I do not believe that they would.

Then, there are moments of another kind to which the Church is no less obviously bound to give her hearty sympathy and support. I mean all movements on the part of the labouring population which are clearly in defence of moral law, and directed against plain violations of it. Employers may not make whatever terms they please with their employees, extort from them excessive exertion, or keep them working in conditions ruinous to health or incompatible with decency and virtue. Nothing like the horrors which were permitted in England before the Factory Acts came into force should again be tolerated among us. Industrial competition has moral limits as well as economic limits, and the former are the more easily discernible and the more sacred, and wherever they are disregarded the Church is bound to protest, and should heartily co-operate with the leaders of labour movements in demanding that those limits be respected. She does not go a step beyond her sphere when she insists that the laws of righteousness shall rule in industrial relations. Let her clergy remember in this respect the glorious example set before them by Kingsley, Maurice, and others.

The movement in favour of the better housing of the poor is of much the same nature as those already referred to, as what it seeks to accomplish is so obviously required for the welfare both of the bodies and the souls of multitudes of the poor. The wretched hovels still to be found in some of our rural districts, and still more the horrible habitations in the slums of our large towns, are a disgrace alike to the civilisation and Christianity of the nation. They cause a destruction of life, especially in its infant stage, far exceeding the losses of war, and an incalculable amount of disease and vice. When houses of one apartment have ceased to be, God's kingdom will have made in our land a very perceptible advance.

I need not speak of the temperance and total abstinence movements, on the importance of which at least all churchmen are agreed.

There are other movements, however, which the Church may well take an interest in and encourage so far as she can but which she can hardly hope to promote directly in any very effective way. I refer to such movements as those which have originated and which sustain Savings Banks, Life Insurance Offices, Friendly Societies, Trades' Unions, Industrial Co-operative Firms, and the like. They are movements of great interest and importance, and the clergy may reasonably be expected to regard them with a sympathetic spirit, or even to take such direct part in them as they usefully can, but they must be directly guided mainly by those most immediately and deeply interested in them and most competent to ensure their success, *i.e.* by industrialists themselves, men versed in business affairs, economists and politicians, not by the clergy. The extent to which the clergy can aid them must depend mainly on the measure of their success in breathing the spirit of self-restraint, prudence, and benevolence, into all classes of society, and especially of the working classes.

Then, there is the great labour movement which manifests itself in a continual struggle for higher wages, and which so often makes its presence felt in gigantic strikes and lock-outs with their many and grievous effects. Trades Unionism is the out-growth of the struggle. It has become an enormous power which some dread and even hate. My belief is that whatever errors and evils it may have been responsible for, it was and is a necessity, and one the tendency of which is towards good, towards progress, not towards anarchy and strife but organisation and peace. I hope and trust that it will become the general rule for labour disputes to be settled by arbitration, not by war maintained until the strength and resources of one or the other party are exhausted. It seems to me to be a very unwise suggestion, however, that the

clergy of the Church should put themselves forward as arbiters. It is very possible that if they did they would not be accepted as such. They can have, as a rule, no special competency for the office. Where they have intervened in great industrial disputes they have generally done so with a very imperfect acquaintance with the relevant facts, and with no advantage to the side which they espoused. Bishop Westcott, it is true, was able to bring to a close the strike of the miners in Durham, but Bishop Westcott, it must be remembered, is a man revered and beloved by all who know him, not only for his learning and talents, but for his piety, self-denial, and charity, as perhaps no other man in England.

If time had permitted I should have liked to have pointed out that in order that the Church might take up an intelligent attitude towards economic and social movements her clergy should have a general acquaintance with economic and social science, and that students intending to enter the ministry of the Church should be encouraged to attend the Political Economy Classes in the Universities; and, further, that the clergy should seek to be more in touch with the labouring classes and labour leaders, especially in mining and manufacturing districts.

I might also have insisted on the connection between the success of the Church in her social mission and the growth and culture of her own spiritual life.

I could also have willingly endeavoured to show that the Church might well take up a hopeful view of her social influence. Notwithstanding the frequent assertions to the contrary, I am convinced that the Church is to-day exerting far more true spiritual influence on society than she did when her external authority over it was greater.

Rev. John Glasse, D.D.—Socialism is not so much a theory as a movement, and, like Christianity, the term has been used to cover tendencies the most diverse and con-

tradictory. We must in seeking a definition be on our guard even against the statements and actions of socialists themselves. The unsocial socialist is a familiar figure at many of their gatherings. I would as soon think of taking my ideas of Christianity from certain prominent members of our churches as I would my ideas of socialism from certain prominent representatives of the party. The spirit of sectarianism is by no means confined to religion. It has appeared in socialism, but the future of the world will not belong to the sects, and the socialists will, like the Christians, refuse to identify themselves with self-satisfied dogmatic cliques. They are already in revolt against them, and have only to discriminate between the accidents and the essence of their system to realise an institution that in catholicity can only be compared to the Mediæval Church.

Many are socialists for the same reason that they are Christians. I do not believe in everything that is connected with socialism, but there is a necessity of being equally discriminate in connection with Christianity. The ethic of both, however, is obviously the same. They insist on brotherhood. Our religion teaches us that there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free. I do not know any system that is more imbued with this idea and more earnest in its realisation than socialism. It is for this reason that elect souls from Plato to Ruskin have been attracted by it. Some of them were more visionary than others, but Carlyle, who had little sympathy with any form of Morrison's pill for social disorders, was most vehement in his denunciation of individualism. They might not agree in proposals for the reform of society, but they rejected with scorn the miserable ideals of orthodox economists. It is manifestly wrong to take advantage of the weak, to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest markets, heedless of what may make them cheap or dear. It is not only false in ethics but in politics to teach that the individual has a right to use his property in every way he pleases, so long as he does not interfere with others. It is possible of course for subtlety

by wriggling and twisting to extract a meagre truth from such a maxim, but as commonly understood it is simply the doctrine of Cain. It was the Christianity of Maurice and Kingsley that impelled them to socialism. The former soon became painfully conscious of the difficulties involved in the new situation, and longed for the serenity of his study, but in spite of his hesitation about practical affairs he never wavered in his ethical conviction, and its intensity may be measured by its compression. "Competition is a lie." It is no doubt easy to quibble at the expression, but the meaning of Maurice was not ambiguous. He knew well enough that there will always be and should be emulation, the natural exhibition of various gifts, the desire to improve on the past achievements of oneself or of others, even when not impelled by any special need on the part of society. One finds the highest pleasure in this self-realisation through skilful and efficient work, but such competition is ethically in diametrical opposition to that condemned by Maurice, and with which experience unfortunately makes us often painfully familiar—a competition whose inspiration is desire for one's own glory, whose method is without sympathy or scruple, and whose consummation threatens misery and ruin.

The strength of Christian socialism lay in its moral protest, for its practical outcome only consisted in the doubtful experiment of those co-operative associations that have been a bone of contention among co-operators themselves. This fact reminds one of the Protean nature of socialism. It eludes definition, and no party has in their criticism and theories realised more fully than its supporters what Lassalle calls "the category of history." He blames the economists for failing to do so. They assumed the perpetuity of capitalism, and confounded an epoch in the development of industry with a law of nature. It has not only had an origin but will have a termination, and will prepare the world according to its wisdom and goodness for something better or worse. Socialism has passed from the utopian to

the scientific stage, and under Marx was fairly delivered from the reproach of artificiality. The idea of development finds full expression in his writings. He exaggerates in fact the impotence of the individual. You cannot supersede capitalism. It must run its course before there is any chance for socialism. One of the worst faults to my mind in the great book of Marx is its glorification of material as opposed to moral forces, but its effect has been mainly in the direction of sanity. It passed sentence of death on isolation. The movement henceforth became not merely national but cosmopolitan, and was to be realised not by the establishment of labour colonies, but by the control of political institutions. It recognised the importance of co-operation and trade unionism, but maintained that they were helpless by themselves. They were only opportunities to organise labour for the capture of power. Marx turned socialism into a class war, and in doing so allowed his hatred to influence his judgment. The worker had hitherto been in the habit of looking at his employer in the light of an oppressor. It is true that Marx by his theory of surplus value encouraged this impression, but he also pointed out that the employer was no more the originator of capitalism than the worker, and might equally be its victim. The manufacturer no doubt took advantage of the competition among labourers to squeeze down wages, but he had to part with his profits through competition for markets, and was always in danger of being reduced to the ranks of the proletariat. A certain sympathy was thus naturally created for the capitalist, and the war against capitalism became, in the eyes of many, a work of emancipation. One realised the solidarity of socialism, and hailed it as a gospel not merely for the workers but for the people. The influence of Marx is a tribute to his ability. It is largely owing to him that the socialists of to-day are so thoroughly in touch with reality, and are not only practical in their programme but in their methods. It would of course be the easiest thing in the world to refute this statement by a reference

to the attitude of the Social Democratic Federation, and they profess to be the most faithful disciples of Marx. They have, like their master, done much for socialism, but they do not greatly increase in numbers, and never will without some serious change in their ideas and methods. In becoming political, socialism ceased of necessity to be millennial and catastrophic; but this mood is sometimes repeated in the utterances and actions of the Federation. They live in the expectation of a crisis by the improvement of which the country will be captured for socialism, and will forthwith secure the public ownership of the means of production. This is a dream. All experience assures us that such a change must be gradual, and in every country with representative government it will be constitutional. There may, of course, be riots over industrial disputes and during industrial depression, but they are not essential to socialism, and will do nothing to advance it. If it is to succeed at all it must be by convincing the sober and conservative majority of the community that private ownership for wealth-production fails to render social service, and threatens to develop into social tyranny. The conviction will come slowly, and the realisation will be piecemeal. There will be no expropriation of landlords, no confiscation of capital, except by means of taxation, and this must also commend itself to our sense of justice. It is long since the Fabian Society pointed out these probabilities, and they now meet with a ready acceptance among socialists. They are finding powerful supporters in Germany. One of these, Bernstein, has lately published a book on the subject, and had to defend himself at a recent conference in Hanover, with the result that the party has abandoned its uncompromising attitude in politics. One feels that to commit oneself to the infallibility of Marx is simply to hinder the progress of socialism. As a friendly critic of Bernstein's book writing in the *Fabian News* (Sept. 1899) puts it: "We must reconstruct our ideas of socialism, and bring them into accord with facts. The Marxian dialectic, the labour theory of value, the materialistic theory of history,

are all of no practical use. We must cease fixing our eyes on the distant end, and attend to the movement, that is the main concern. Much is to be hoped for from the co-operative movement and the development of wholesale societies. There, and in the trade unions, we shall learn how to control and manage industry. The attainment of the political and economic rights of the workers is our immediate purpose; universal suffrage above all, and the development of municipal activity. Until there is a better equipped, better educated working class, nothing much can be done. Every improvement in the condition of labour is to be welcomed and fostered. Socialism will come from the growth of national wealth, not through misery and the bankruptcy court." These are the lines on which labour is at present organising itself, and it is in this direction that I look for the development of socialism.

Let me bring under your notice one or two features of the movement worthy of consideration as well as of sympathy. Contrast, for example, its attitude with that of trade unions. The latter taught the workers to seek their emancipation by means of combination. The aim was selfish, the method was war. One is not surprised at the bitterness produced between employers and employed. The unions limited the number of apprentices, interfered with the introduction of machinery, provoked contempt by a hundred and one petty and vexatious restrictions, and when their purpose was thwarted, sometimes wantonly called upon their members to strike. It is impossible to defend however much one may excuse such tactics. Socialists are convinced that they are as futile as they are mischievous. Labour cannot in such a war successfully contend with capital, and it has no right by a selfish and short-sighted policy to promote, with reference to machinery, its own interests at the expense of progress. Socialism seeks, of course, as an ultimate aim, the control of industry, but in trying to eliminate the employer it respects his position. He is a victim of the system to which he belongs, and even the rich, instead of being

considered the oppressors of the poor, are only regarded as an evidence of folly and incapacity on the part of the disinherited. Socialism instead of encouraging strikes insists on arbitration, and in the matter of machinery would leave industry free to develop itself according to its necessities and advantages, always provided that the worker is not to be sacrificed in the process. Man is more than machinery, and for his labour is entitled to sufficient remuneration as well as reasonable leisure. There may, no doubt, be some difficulty in fixing a minimum wage, but the Church through its interest in the smaller livings of the clergy has evidently much sympathy with the endeavour. Such a matter must, of course, be left for adjustment to the unions and the employers before it is considered by society. I shall not, however, in the meantime, trouble myself with the practicality of these proposals, but I submit that the ethical ideal expressed by them is worthy of all respect.

I shall not be surprised if in making these statements I have started in your mind a familiar objection to socialism. I refer to its discouragement of self-help by an appeal to the State. I have only to say in answer that a more bodiless spectre I never met. Co-operation is perhaps the greatest movement of self-help existing in our country, and it owes its initiation and its inspiration as well as much of its direction to socialism. Great, however, as its success has been in our own country there is no instance of self-help in the world to compare with the Workers' Federation of Ghent, and its members are all professed socialists. I should like to ask those impressed by this objection, how socialism can ever be realised apart from self-help? It will only be after the most dogged effort that their measures will be adopted by the State, and what are they? One would think from certain representations that socialists desired to turn the world upside down—to make the master serve the lackey and the rich support the poor — whereas they limit themselves to requesting that some provision should

be made for the old and the infirm, and that industry should be so organised as to enable one to live by one's work, and make an adequate provision for oneself. The demand of the socialist is for work and wages. He does not want doles. What, after all, is the meaning of self-help? I suppose that the late Mr Vanderbilt may be quoted as an eminent example of it. The millionaire, however, does not grow rich by his own labour. He organises the labour of others, captures companies, controls the railways, inspires the press, and constrains the government, forcing them all by his masterful will to spend their energy in filling his coffers. Self-help thus turns out on analysis to have its bad as well as its good side, and may merely be a name for using everything and everyone to the profit of oneself. The only difference between an intelligent plutocrat and an intelligent socialist is that while the one would reserve to himself, the other would return to the community the result of co-operative effort. Again I commend to you most respectfully the ethics of this position.

Let me now, for a little, consider the relation of socialism to Christianity, and here, of course, I have only to do with morals. The dogmas and sacraments of the Church are of interest to it only in so far as they are ethical, and ethical they certainly are. Take, for example, the doctrine of the Incarnation wherein is set forth the divine pity for human misery and depravity; or the Lord's Supper where we celebrate the sacrifice of Jesus, and are reminded that we, after His example, should lay down our lives for the brethren. Some, of course, find in the ethical element the essence of our religion, but even those not prepared to admit its sufficiency will yet confess its importance. We cannot discuss the production and distribution of wealth without considering the question of justice, and Christianity not merely demands righteousness but enjoins mercy, while industry has found ample opportunity for cruelty and oppression. We are

to look not every one on his own things but every one also on the things of others, and are to do to others what we would like done to ourselves. There is no system expressed in the New Testament but a spirit is exhibited and principles are enunciated as the proper basis for our conduct. The disciples of Jesus lived in the expectation of a millennium. We are not strangers but citizens in the world, and this fact must count for much in the realisation of our principles. The Church was their only organisation, and in it one preached and practised equality and mutual assistance. The rich were stewards of their wealth for the poor, and the slave was eligible to the highest office in the community. All were one in Christ. If we are going to change this, and adopt the cult of the superior person, the glorification of the overman, let us understand that in doing so we have abandoned the religion of Jesus to become the disciples of Nietzsche.

But it may be asked are there not atheists among socialists, and are not some more of them indifferent to churches altogether? It is so. But what then? I know many Liberals and Conservatives exactly in the same position. These socialists have not adopted their religious opinions on account of their socialism, but have acquired them through debates at certain clubs and the reading of popular literature. Mr Bradlaugh was not a socialist but many members of secular societies are, and they have brought their secularism with them. Instead of socialism having any tendency to atheism it demands as a basis for its hope and work a belief in the righteous government of the universe, and has invariably tempered the bitterness of atheists. It has induced them to respect and venerate the great martyr of humanity. All over the world, even in meetings where the clergy are denounced, the name of Jesus is received with acclamation. He is looked on by them as a pioneer and a prophet of socialism. They feel themselves in the closest agreement with the

moral teaching of Scripture. Jesus has told us that the whole of religion may be summed up in love to God and one's neighbour, while as the Epistle of St John reminds us, love to God must be shown through love to men (1 John iv. 12). Socialism is thus really an attempt to apply Christian principles to our industrial life, and if some of its supporters may have a difficulty with our metaphysical, our sacramentarian and our ecclesiastical systems, the difficulty is not peculiar to them, but is shared with many both outside and inside our churches.

The relation of socialism to our religious denominations was an object of special consideration at the last annual conference of the Social Democratic Federation. It condemned sacerdotalism as anti-democratic; but the chief speaker, Mr Burrows, while maintaining that "human life can never be built up entirely on economics," went on to protest against the idea that "economic socialism as such is to be based on any particular speculative view of the universe at large, whether that view be spiritual or material, religious or non-religious, theological or non-theological. . . . Any Christian has an absolute right to base his socialism, if he chooses, upon Christ, but that is for himself alone and not for others, and the same applies to atheism." Socialism is thus really a movement springing from economic ideas, and aiming at industrial democracy, but it tends to widen out into a theory of life, and as such lays all knowledge under contribution. It occupies a position of neutrality towards our churches, and allows its members the fullest freedom with regard to them. It has always, however, been indifferent towards Disestablishment, not that it is opposed to it, but it looks on it as a middle-class measure of little value to working people. What has led it to favour it at all is simply the sectarianism and scepticism prevailing in society for which it is not specially responsible. If there were anything like unanimity on the subject of religion socialism would naturally desire to nationalise it, but it does not do so in present circumstances. It has vacillated

in its policy towards Disestablishment, but it has been consistently indifferent to it.

The Church, however, cannot be indifferent to such a movement, for it furnishes many opportunities of usefulness. It concerns itself with questions deeply affecting the welfare of the people, and has secured the adherence of nearly all the able young men connected with the industrial organisations of our own and other countries. It is not of course our business to divide the inheritance. Our duty is to condemn covetousness. But the Church is not confined to the clergy. If we preach Christian principles the laity are competent enough to undertake their application. There is no necessity for our getting entangled in the details either of opinion or of organisation. The welfare of the people has not hitherto been a question of party. If we had Cobden we had also Shaftesbury, and both lived to deserve the gratitude of the nation. Whatever one may think about the present Government, it would be the meanest folly not to recognise the great value of the Workmen's Compensation Act, and their praiseworthy efforts to frame an Old Age Pension Bill. The Conservatives have never been unwilling to secure a minimum of comfort to the workers, and have always been preserved from the soulless errors of economic pedantry. The social and sanitary were favourite subjects with Lord Beaconsfield. There is still a great work for them to do in the uplifting of the people without in any way compromising their principles. A moderate socialism is indeed the truest conservatism. I am not a believer in the policy indicated by the phrase, "Bread and the circus." It is better to help one to get his dinner by working for it than to let one have it without work, and coarse amusements are the worst opiates. They simply deaden one's sense of responsibility in a situation where apathy means ruin and activity salvation. It is another matter when you provide education, whether through schools, lectures, libraries, or museums, but in order that people may appreciate such things and profit by them, one

must secure them sufficient leisure and decent surroundings. The housing of the poor is a clamant necessity in our large cities, and the work of many is still oppressive, the hours being often most numerous where the work is most repellent and least remunerative. We cannot, of course, in any absolute fashion insist on the stoppage of Sunday labour, but an effort should be made to reduce it to a minimum, and one whole day in seven should certainly as a sabbath be secured to every worker in the country.

These are a few questions in which we might all interest ourselves, and their proper solution would do much to improve the condition of labour. We are apt, in our comfort, to forget that a third of the population of our large cities are living in the midst of squalor and depravity, damned from their birth by an inheritance of evil and the indifference of society. They call in their misery for our assistance, and we must help them if they are to rise at all. It is nothing to tell us that they drink. We should all drink in such circumstances. Mr Booth attributes drink as the immediate cause of the situation to only fourteen per cent. of the very poor. Drink is no doubt a great evil, but it is as much an effect as a cause, and will never be eradicated by preaching and prohibition. It scares one to think of this dark weltering gulf of sin and suffering at the bottom of society, into which so many are falling, and out of which so few emerge. Men of all parties might surely unite to fill up with merciful and patriotic effort this yawning chasm in our Forum. Were this done much would become possible. A man's life does not consist in the abundance of commodities. Let us secure one a minimum—a fulcrum on which to place his lever—and then let him use his strength for his own salvation. What is wanted is not an equal distribution of goods, but equal possibilities of manhood. The people would soon learn in improved conditions that the merchandise of wisdom is more precious than that of gold, and would naturally change their desires with their convic-

tions. Merit would take the place of money. Discontent would disappear. But so long as we associate our glory with material advantages so long will their possession excite the envy of the covetous, and their splendour be dimmed by the tears of the poor.

Rev. J. M. Robertson, M.A. — I shall confine my remarks chiefly to the consideration of the specific relations of the Church of Scotland to social and economic questions. In doing so I assume that the general principles which have on the whole determined the attitude of the Christian Church from the beginning towards such questions underlie the particular manner in which circumstances have constrained our special branch to view and handle them. These general principles, taken apart from the spiritual comforts of religion with all their mollifying influences, may be denominated the recognition and enforcement as between man and man, and as far as the authority of the Church extends, of justice, charity, and fraternity. Of justice, as securing the practice of fair-dealing, the rights of property, freedom of contract, and the like, indispensable to society in all economic transactions; of charity as preserving from ruin the poor and weak; and of fraternity as binding the parts of the social organism together and maintaining it a unity, "one body having many members." It is true that in the course of historical events now one of these principles and now another has obtained prominence in the Church. It is also true that extreme statements and one-sided applications of them have from time to time been made. The community of goods in the infant Church, the subsequent rise of monastic orders and the glorification of poverty, the communistic schemes put forth from the days of the Ebionites to those of the Moravian brethren and the celebrated mission at Paraguay last century, show that the idea of fraternity has not unfrequently been strained to excess. On the other hand, the principle of justice and authority has often been so abused as to lend to the

Church the appearance of being a mere tool in the hands of ambitious and unscrupulous men. But apart from such aberrations I think one may safely affirm that, taking its history as a whole, the Church Catholic has been to humanity the guardian of justice, love, and brotherhood held in harmonious relation. I may be told that these are secular virtues, that they are the ethical heritage of the race, independently of religious or Christian belief. Such a proposition is grossly untrue. From the earliest antiquity, and among all nations, practical morality has rested on religion. In the Economics of Xenophon, for example, religious offerings and prayer precede instruction in social and family duties. Much more was Christian morality, the morality to which we are now used, deeply rooted in Christian worship and belief. Throughout the entire mediæval period, to which certain socialists longingly look back, it was the Church which taught statesmen how to rule and princes how to decree justice. If now the modern state, acting through the central legislature or through municipal government, as we have so gladly heard to-night, has learned the doctrine of the equality of rights among all classes of society and accepted the responsibility of relieving or even extinguishing poverty within its pale, if it has become at once just and philanthropic, sensitive to the claims and needs of all its members, high and low, rich and poor, that result is simply due to its appropriation of the ethical maxims and commonplaces of the Christian Church. The name of Christ may not appear in a single statute regulating hours of labour, compensation for injuries, poor relief or old-age pensions. None the less without His Gospel having its central expression in the Church and impressing upon successive generations the rights and duties implied in it no such humanitarian legislation would have been contemplated. Not a trace of it appears in anti-Justinian codes.

The Church of Scotland, then, in common with all other branches of the Christian Church, has to do with the

application of the principles to which I have alluded. But account must be taken of her own peculiar position. Evidently a Protestant and especially a Presbyterian Church must hold a somewhat different relation towards social movements to that held by the Roman Catholic Church which has lately, both before and after the famous encyclicals of Leo XIII., manifested a strong interest in them. We may be easily misled by Continental writers on sociology and social questions if we forget that they are confronted with a vast hierarchical system interfering through the Confessional with every detail of private life and wielding a power utterly unknown in our land. The excessive weight, too, laid on charity in the narrower sense of almsgiving strongly differentiates the Roman Catholic Church from ours. Fogazzaro, in his famous and beautiful novel "Piccolo mondo antico," published three or four years ago, describes the piety of a lady of Lombardy as wholly consisting in these two things—charity to the poor and the Rosary. Many centuries ago one of the Christian fathers said that no place of public worship was complete without the beggars at its door so as to allow of the exhibition of the finest of the Christian graces, and quite in keeping with this traditional view the relief of the poor through religious foundations has systematically occupied the attention of the Church of Rome, even in the face of forcible confiscations of her property by greedy laymen. We cannot but recognise the good work so performed although we cannot possibly proceed on the same lines or adopt the same methods. To the secular socialism, so rampant abroad and pervaded through and through with atheism, she has offered, not without a considerable measure of success, a Christian socialism of her own, practically combating and mitigating social evils under the shadow of the Church. There has been no such counter-balancing agency among Protestants as far as I am aware, except the defunct Christian socialism of Kingsley and others in England and that of Pastor Stöcker

in Berlin, also a short-lived movement, terminating in Anti-Semitism pure and simple.

We of the Church of Scotland can hardly engage in similar agitations, for we make no pretension of dictating to the State, nor are we a hierarchy aspiring to universal domination. We are content to sow the good seed in our own little corner of the field, believing its fruit will ripen in due time under the divine blessing. The constitution and history of our Church enable us to form a correct judgment as to the nature of its relations to social and economic questions. It is impossible to overlook, in this respect, the advantages we possess in the composition of the lowest court of the Church by which its discipline is immediately administered and its business managed. Kirk-sessions, or consistories, constitute the practical arm of our own and every Presbyterian Church. Through kirk-sessions the moral and social order of the country was preserved during the political anarchy of the seventeenth century, and through kirk-sessions the poor were relieved till the passing of the Poor-Law Act, so deeply deplored by Chalmers. It must always be kept in view that these bodies are not a clerical corporation. The minister who presides has not even a deliberative vote in their proceedings. You have here therefore a body of religious men, in complete personal touch with the every-day needs, industries, and movements of the community around them, selected to the position in virtue of their intelligence and probity, animated by conscientious motives, and guided by a president whose special function it is to expound those cardinal principles of equity, charity, and fraternity, the perfect fulfilment of which is the ideal to which social reformers of every age have looked forward. Can it be maintained that such a body is not peculiarly well fitted to deal with the difficulties and problems that emerge from time to time from the complications of modern society, at all events to co-operate with other agencies in suppressing the immoralities of trade, the plagues of vice and poverty, the class antagonisms of our

social state? Probably very many will reject the idea, regarding it an impossible reversion to a buried past. They have become familiarised with more recent organisations for overtaking social necessities and are inclined to look on kirk-sessions as an anachronism. The thoroughly unjust assault directed against them as trustees for behoof of the poor in the last Local Government Act would seem to indicate that the majority who passed the Act believed public opinion in Scotland to be on their side. I am convinced they were mistaken. Not only the poor themselves but the bulk of the Scottish people still prefer the administration of benevolence, with the delicacy of feeling and the accurate knowledge of its objects it requires, by the Church through her ministers and elders to that performed by any fluctuating secular body. The traditions and genius of the past have moulded our character as a people. We cannot forget that for three centuries poverty in Scotland was prevented and relieved by kirk-sessions. I say "prevented" in the first place, for in the true Protestant spirit they never fostered pauperism or invited a crowd of mendicants to haunt church doors but stimulated individual energy, self-help, and the desire of independence, while providing for the absolutely necessitous. Under this vanished system of poor-relief, Scotland once held the foremost place in Europe for thrift and shrewdness, as it also did for education and very much for the same reason. A popular church, democratic in the best sense of the term, altruistic, as every true church must be, yet not unmindful of the place the opposite principle holds in human affairs, deeply penetrated with faith, almost mystical, in the divine counsels of redeeming grace, yet withal intensely practical in the conduct of its own business,—surely that is one eminently capable of solving successfully whatever social problems are brought before it.

I should like to add that in my opinion the services of our Church throw the light of pure and undefiled religion on some of the most vexed and complex questions

of our time. Our worship is simple and spiritual, such as commends itself to the hearts of those who have a sore fight for food and raiment, to whom the essentials of life are everything and its superfluities almost unknown. In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as we observe it, in its primitive form, the unity and solidarity of the brotherhood of man is symbolised at the common table where, as one body, the Church holds communion with her Lord, and yet, in the very same act each communicant, giving and receiving the sacred elements, finds his own highest interests attended to and advanced. Is there no lesson here for those thinkers on social subjects who stand paralysed before the impossibility of reconciling individualism and collectivism? I need hardly refer to the pulpit—the right hand of the Scottish Church. There is no class of religious teachers in the world so closely identified with the people as the ministers of the Church of Scotland, call it, if you will, Established, Free, or United Presbyterian. In many districts they have paid the penalty of their intimate sympathies with the ploughman and artizan by the desertion from their services of vain landowners and *parvenus* who prefer to worship apart from the common crowd. We cannot expect that these ministers and their kirk-sessions will ever again hold the position of legal influence in social and economic affairs which they once enjoyed. But their assistance in all measures of social amelioration would be of immense benefit to municipal corporations, while the recent return, in educational matters, to the methods of the Church in her inspection and control of the Parochial Schools affords ground for the hope that experience will yet teach the State the wisdom of calling in the Church to its aid in its supervision of the necessities of the poor. Whatever the future hides behind its curtain the Church of Scotland, as part of the universal Church of Christ can never, without incurring the guilt of infidelity to her Head, hear unmoved the cry of suffering

humanity, or view with indifference the billowy fluctuations of society as it passes from one stage of evolution to another. Let the State do what it will, the Church must press forward in its promotion of Temperance and Purity. She must take part in every well-directed movement for the increase of comfort in the homes of the people. She will check, as far as her discipline reaches, dishonesty in trade and speculative gambling. She cannot look idly on while capital and labour are at grips with each other. She will endeavour to bring the unnatural warfare to a close by the combination and co-operation of two forces, neither of which can exist without the other. Her ministers must study the sciences connected with the production and distribution of wealth, and carefully watch in the manufacture and exchange of commodities, in the rise of joint stock companies and in other features of industrial life the natural means of accomplishing good and beneficent ends. The Church should regard with disdain those pompous socialistic systems which find favour abroad, partly the offspring of misunderstood science and cloudy metaphysics, partly living like fungi, on the putrescence and plagues they profess to cure. Steadfastly relying on the eventual triumph of the principles of justice, love, and brotherhood contained in the revelation entrusted to her of the Eternal God and His Son Christ Jesus, she must continue fearlessly to assert and vindicate them for the good of mankind and the honour due to their divine character and source.

The Rev. A. Wallace Williamson, Edinburgh.—My Lord Provost, Ladies and Gentlemen,—It is no easy matter within the compass of a short address, such as alone is possible here, to deal satisfactorily with any phase of the wide subject which has been already so ably opened up and eloquently discussed in the papers to which we have just listened. I can only hope to indicate one or two plain principles which it seems to me necessary to assert and maintain, if the Church is to meet the demands

made upon her by modern conditions of life, and to assist in the solution of the new problems which those conditions have created. I shall endeavour, therefore, to say a few words on some aspects of the Social Mission of the Church.

And first, I would venture to say that it is not unnecessary to recall the fact that there is a corporate Church in existence. Perhaps I utter a truism when I make such a statement, but it is a truism which lies at the core of every attempt to deal with social questions in the light of our Christian religion. It is because our religion, by its very nature, bears this social and corporate character that it has continued to exist and to exert its power among men. I grant you that it is one of the most miserable features of our present divided state that the real function of the Church of Christ as a universal social power is so terribly obscured. But nothing can alter the fact that the Church does exist, and that in her very constitution she is a real social brotherhood—a brotherhood which is intended to realise a true moral and social unity, intended to unite men by indissoluble bonds of conviction and sympathy, justice and truth. That is a supreme, unalterable characteristic of the Church which no failure on her part at certain periods of her history can utterly efface or destroy. Sometimes, if not even often, it has been permitted to fall into abeyance, but even then it is only dormant, not dead, always ready to respond to a real and earnest call. In fact I make bold to say that, but for the teaching of the Church, and but for the ideal which she has held before the world from her earliest days until now, we would certainly have had the same problems to meet, but we should have been bereft of the one inspiring motive, the one divine principle of human brotherhood which alone will ever bring men even within measurable distance of their solution. I do not think it is too strong a thing to say that the Church of Christ is the only power on earth which (did she fully and fairly realise them), can face the enormous and complicated problems of the present and near future. I

believe that she bears within herself the power. Nothing but a paralysis of selfishness can hinder its being put forth when she realises that a Social Mission is inherent in her very nature.

And what is this social mission of the Church? It is simply to realise the fact of human brotherhood to which she offers her testimony. Again I confess I utter a truism. But, my Lord Provost, if the world had remembered those truisms; if professed Christians had not cried out when they were urged to remember them, "Am I my brother's keeper," we would have had no such problems to face—at least the greatest and most serious of them would have disappeared. There would be no such grinding of the poor; there would be no such oppressive hours of labour; there would be no such over-crowding as we see in Christian cities. Three-fourths at least of our social difficulties would have disappeared. I do not say all of them. I do not dispute the fact that there are economic laws which would have worked out their bitter results in spite of the greatest goodwill among men. But I do say, and this I think is one main aspect of the subject which the Church is bound to face, that if she were true to herself, true to the great principle which is of the very essence of her existence, she would permeate society with that principle in such a way that many present abuses would speedily collapse and fall to the ground. She would bring to bear that invincible power of principle with which in her early days she confronted the abominations of paganism, "refuted its philosophies, routed its legions, regenerated its corrupt society, re-inspired and re-constructed its shattered institutions." And she would accomplish that great work by the only practical and possible method — calling up her reserves of unused force, her hundreds and thousands within her ranks who forget that the streets of the New Jerusalem will not be clean until "each sweeps before his own door" and endeavours to contribute his own quota to the work of social amelioration.

I have said that this spirit of brotherhood is always ready to respond to a real and earnest call. Now I can conceive of no circumstances which would constitute a call so loud and clear as the circumstances of our own time. And I would fain hope that our meeting to-night would at least assist us in the endeavour to realise the urgency of that call. For it seems to me axiomatic that the Church can only fulfil her social mission by rousing her members to take an intelligent and sympathetic interest in all that concerns the welfare of their fellow-men. No remedy will ever be found for our social evils until a healthy and well-informed public opinion is created; and such an opinion is impossible without practical knowledge and practical sympathy. I do not require to reproduce here in detail the outstanding facts of our social condition, but I do most sincerely believe that they require to be dinned again and again in our ears. When I hear optimistic reports as to the activity and progress of the Church's work, I am thankful that something has been done; but when I think of what yet remains, when I think of a city like this, where —I am not exaggerating when I say—tens of thousands never enter a place of worship, I certainly agree with one of the most eloquent of English preachers, that in such a case "the Church should rather be sitting in dust and ashes than glorifying herself about her own activity."

What are the facts, my Lord Provost, which you and those who hold office with you in this great city are well aware of, and which we who are ministers meet as we go about among the people, the glaring and anomalous facts in a Christian community which hinder the spread of moral and spiritual teaching and which make it so hard to sweeten the breath of city life for human souls? The Bishop of Stepney, well known for his work in East London, has well described them as a seven-headed monster. There is the grinding of ceaseless competition, there is consequent mutual suspicion, there is the oppression of the old and unskilful, there is the grave evil of over-crowding, one of the most fruitful sources

of moral degradation, there is deep-seated class bitterness, there is the demon of intemperance, and there is rank paganism. These are the outstanding facts of the situation, and as far as they are affected by conditions beyond the control of the people themselves they call loudly for a remedy. I believe that legislation can do much, I believe that wise municipal effort can do much, and all such effort should have, as it certainly has had in this city, the direct and strenuous support of the Church. If we cannot remove the evils of ceaseless competition, we can at least do much to mitigate the results by placing throughout those dark and dreary regions of our cities, bright and attractive places where rest and recreation can be easily found, where temptation will be disarmed, and where the strain of daily toil will be lightened. But there is something beyond and behind legislation. It is that the Church in the person of its wealthier or more fortunate members should come into living touch with their poorer brethren. There is surely something rotten in the state of Denmark when in all great cities the West and the East continue to stand so far apart in the life and work of the Church. There is surely something deeply wrong when we can enter church after church full of well-dressed people with no sign of the really poor, where almost unbidden the thought arises, "Methinks that Christ and His Apostles twelve had scarce been welcome there." I do not think that I am exaggerating when I say that an intelligent and sympathetic interest in the conditions under which our fellow-mortals live, is far from being general in the Church of to-day. It is greatly to be deplored because such a living personal interest, if it were wide-spread, would do much to mitigate many evils and would suggest remedies for others. Prince Kropotkin used to say, "Empty the slums and fill the villas." I do not suggest so sudden and drastic a remedy, but I do say that if you could empty the villas even for a week into the slums, if the dwellers in the villas were to go down and see with their own eyes the conditions of which they only vaguely hear, you would have

behind you a body of living sympathy which would make city improvements simple and which would elevate the whole tone and life of the Christian community. It has always been so in true social progress. Knowledge of the facts has produced sympathy and sympathy has found a way. I need only instance the measures regulating child labour and the improvement in the treatment of prisoners associated with the honourable name of John Howard. It is this method of personal contact and personal interest in which alone there is any real hope. And the Christian Church has all the organisation necessary. She merely requires to inspire it with life and earnestness, for the Social Mission which she is called to fulfil can only be fulfilled by thus generating and fostering the spirit of active brotherhood, and by inspiring all her members with that enthusiasm of humanity which was the mark of Christ's work on earth, and which, please God, will never die till the power of righteousness is triumphant and we enter on a new heaven and a new earth.

My Lord Provost, it is now more than a quarter of a century since a great statesman, then Lord Rector of your famous University, in addressing the students, spoke of "a disturbing spirit which was then rising like a moaning wind in Europe, and which, when the youth before him entered the world, might possibly be a raging storm." I do not say that the storm he predicted has already broken, but the signs are certainly no less threatening. The seething forces underlying our modern civilisation are no less active. And if the Church continues to turn a deaf ear to the ground swell of social discontent "murmuring restlessly in the great ocean of humanity," she cannot expect that men will take her claims seriously or listen to her half-hearted words. She must go forth in the spirit of her Master. She must go down as He went among the people. She must be the friend, as He was, of the poor and the outcast, not the sentimental patron but the real personal friend. She must learn that her mission is not, as she has too often deemed it, to

throw copious floods of cold water on all schemes of social amelioration, but to recognise in the wildest of them a germ of truth to which she is bound to listen. When she is told that in this country we weave as much cloth as would cover the face of the planet, and yet there are thousands of its inhabitants unclothed, when she knows that those same thousands are living on the very edge of death through sheer want of food, while multitudes of their fellow-men born in other circumstances are revelling in idleness and plenty, she must not take refuge in commonplaces about the value of the soul. It is one of the certainties of the situation that you will not heal men's spiritual diseases by making light of their bodily distress or material destitution. It was a clever but cynical preacher who once said, "Once or twice Jesus had got into immense favour with the multitude by giving them as much as they could eat. Whereupon they would come and take Him by force to make Him a King." And then he proceeded to moralise on what he called stomach loyalty and animal enthusiasm. But this is a somewhat superficial sneer. Unless you show men that you have a genuine interest in the clamant needs of the body, you will never persuade them that you have any real concern for what you call their souls. No man has ever succeeded in bringing starving, discontented men to Christ. Christ Himself did not succeed. He had compassion on the multitude, sympathised with all their needs and so drew them to Himself; "won their confidence, braced their energies, kindled their hopes and made life seem to them noble and beautiful once more."

And this remains still the Social Mission of the Church. I believe that she is rising to meet it as she never did before. I believe there is much to encourage and stimulate us in the progress of the last hundred years. It is a striking fact that at the end of a century which has struggled and struggled successfully for individual liberty, we are face to face with a situation in which the individual is passionately asked to merge that liberty in the general welfare.

What de Tocqueville said has come true, that if the great questions which occupied the earlier part of the century were mainly political, those which would convulse the world at its close would be mainly social. And what has happened in the sphere of politics has happened also in the sphere of religion. For the whole tendency of the religious movement at the beginning of the century was individualistic. But now the view of the Church's duty has widened to embrace every department of human life. She is not only a preacher of personal salvation but an apostle of social redemption. To abdicate this position is to stultify herself in the eyes of mankind.

Speaking therefore as I do at this first Congress of the Church of Scotland, I look forward with great hopefulness to the deepened interest of which this meeting gives promise in the social needs of the people, in those pressing problems which so deeply and vitally affect the religious and spiritual well-being of the people. I believe that as a National Church we are specially called to this wider duty. There are two great principles on which such a National Church as ours rests—the greatest that have ever moved the mind of man—patriotism and religion—the love of country and the love of God. It is in the active union of these two principles that I see the motive power for the Social Mission of the Church in our native land. And in the fostering of those two principles lies the true secret of the future. It is a spurious churchmanship which divorces itself from patriotism, and it is a poor patriotism which divorces itself from religion. But a living union of both will go far. Never will the social problems of the time be solved by mere theorising, by men standing aloof and touching the fringe of these grave questions with mere words. When we go back to the sources of our religion what do we find? Christ gives us no theories, no panaceas, no cut and dry solutions. But this we do find. Where the poor are, there He is; where the outcast are, there He is; where the sick and dying are, there He is. His hand is ever ready to help,

to heal, to bless. And what Christ did His Church must continue to do.

> "God give us men ; a time like this demands
> Great hearts, strong minds, true faith and willing hands."

Mr W. F. G. ANDERSON proposed a vote of thanks to the speakers, who, he said, had put their subjects before them in a clear and able manner. The reception they had given to Professor Flint showed how much they appreciated his services. He was a man of European and American reputation, and he had never rendered better service—at least not for a long time—than in the address he had given them that night. The other speakers had long devoted their attention to the subjects that they had dealt with, not only in a theoretical, but in a practical way. One of the speakers, he thought, was rather disposed to take a despondent view of matters. That was possible if one confined his attention merely to work done by the Church, but in a city like Glasgow, considering the multiplicity of associations outside the Church, they should be encouraged a great deal in considering the work carried on in their midst. It was very fortunate that they had the Lord Provost of Glasgow presiding in their midst, as he had always taken a great interest in economic and social questions.

The Rev. Dr NORMAN MACLEOD, Inverness, said that on the previous night the Corporation of Glasgow had given a magnificent welcome to the Congress, and nobody could have expressed that welcome in more graceful language than the Lord Provost used on that occasion. He had presided over the present public meeting not in any formal way ; at the outset he had favoured them with a thoughtful and well-balanced address. It seemed singularly appropriate, in view of the subjeet that had engaged their attention this evening, that their deliberations should be presided over by the Chief Magistrate of a city which had always been foremost among cities of the Empire in efforts to improve the condition of the people.

The proceedings then terminated with the Benediction.

SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

THE CHURCH: ITS SERVICES, AND THEIR ADAPTATION TO THE NECESSITIES OF THE PRESENT DAY.

Papers.

Very Rev. J. Marshall Lang, D.D.—The time allowed for my contribution to the great subject of this morning is so short that I must exclude from my purview all generalities as to the nature and objects of Christian worship—all indeed that is not strictly relevant to the purpose of this paper. I must not allow myself even to refer to some topics, *e.g.* the celebration of the Sacraments of the Church, whose consideration is not only relevant, but is almost essential to a satisfactory presentation of my theme. All that I shall attempt is to offer some remarks which I hope may prove useful and suggestive on the desiderata of congregational worship.

I

Of these desiderata the first which I notice is a deepened sense of the responsibility of every member of the Church for the worship which is offered in the sanctuary.

Prevalent modes of speech indicate prevalent tones of mind. We all know that the matter which bulks most in the talk and the thought of the average church-goer is the preacher and the preaching. Now we do not need to disparage the sermon. Never was definite, faithful, forceful preaching, not in the language of books but in that of life, issuing from the preacher as "a living experience, a glowing enthusiasm, an intense reality," more urgently called for than in our day. The people have, it is true, many chan-

nels of knowledge; but the *sermo*, the discourse, the spoken utterance, is indispensable to the full power of man on men. In the Scottish Church, as in other Presbyterian churches, the intellectual element in ministry has been made prominent. I would not have it otherwise, provided the "logic is wrought in fire, not in frost."

But we must beware lest, in magnifying the preacher's vocation, we dwarf the more distinctly worshipful aspect o the Christian assembly. The sermon is a part of the worship, but only a part. As representing man's highest end, as uniting the faculties and affections of the soul on the sublimest object, as interpreting, in its most distinct form, the priesthood of believers, the parts which combine "hearts and hands and voices" have not a second place but the first. We lose much by not emphasizing this; by not insisting that, apart from the hearing of the sermon, there is the duty which rests on every Christian person of associating himself with his fellow-Christians in the offices of worship, and of doing his utmost to make these in some measure worthy. Persons demand more of the preacher than in very many cases they can find. And when they regard themselves as hearers, when the one thing in the service is what they are to hear or get, when they do not recognise that they have a ministry, a responsibility, which is not to be measured by the merit or demerit of the preacher, then they have what seems to be a sufficient excuse for absence from the ordinances of the Church. What is wanted for a congregational worship that shall express the true conception of the Church, is, as I have said, a more vital and operative consciousness that every one who claims to be a member of the Church is bound to take the part of a priest unto God, to bring his offering and come into the courts of the Lord.

II

It follows from this, as the second of the desiderata which I notice, that congregational worship should give

effect to the principle that it is not rendered for or merely to the congregation, but by it.

The praise of the church, for instance, should really interpret the emotion of the worshippers. We are not called to discuss varieties of music. Only let us remember that there are varieties of ear, of taste, of feeling to be considered. I am not myself enamoured of anthems, yet Dr Dale, a sturdy Nonconformist, writes to a lady, who apparently was even less partial to them than I am,—"The anthem is, I believe, to many—I know it is to some—one of the most helpful parts of the service. I don't think that any sermon on the words, 'The Lord is mindful of His own,' could do so much for me as the anthem when it is well sung, and my case is that of many others." Such a case, in these days of higher musical culture, should be respected, and room should be made for it. In the assembling of ourselves together, each is not to insist on having his own way and that alone; all are to consider one another. But surely the rule for church praise is that its style shall be such as, first of all, lauds and magnifies God with due solemnity and purity both in manner and in spirit, and as, secondly, can be "understanded of" and joined in by the people. I would rather sacrifice the fine music to secure the hearty, than cultivate the fine music and prevent the hearty.

So again with regard to prayer. We have done little to educate, we may have done much to obscure, the conception of the common prayer. In the extempore (which should not however be the unpremeditated), utterance there is a wonderful power of touching heart chords. But this, on one condition—the spiritual man, the man of God who has the liberty of the Transfiguration-mount, the liberty also which comes through experience of the human life and intense sympathy with the souls of men. Ah! what a condition that is.

The deficient element in our worship is frequently to be found in the prayers. They may be confused and

rambling. They may be eloquent and rhetorical. They may be cold and didactic, wholly wanting in the peculiar force called unction. They may be long and tedious. They may be short, but feeble. They may be spoken in a shrill key, declamatory, almost dictatorial in tone, lacking in reverence, in all that bespeaks the sense of the Adorable Presence. It is this, the baldness, the sterility, sometimes the vulgarity of the prayer, that repels many, and that fails to evoke the spirit of grace and supplications in those who are not repelled. And the congregation is dependent on the individual minister. Should it be so entirely dependent? Does this entire dependence educate in the consciousness of co-operation in worship as in service.

The ideal of the public prayer, as I apprehend it, is a partial liturgy, one that shall be, not master but servant, aiding, not supplanting, the spontaneous prayer, securing that the congregation shall be voiced in the deepest and most universal needs of the life, providing an order for the confession of sin, the united intercession, the administration of the sacraments, and other special functions. In the common prayer the association of all in worship is most fully expressed by the responses. Without them a prescribed service is almost sure to be stiff and formal.

In my recent visit to America I was struck with the development of some features of worship. The Presbyterians of the United States are, in some respects, more conservative of traditions than we are. But I never heard congregations more heartily united in the audible expression of the Lord's Prayer, and I never saw a more solemn and beautiful recognition of the offertory or collection, as a part of the worship, than in churches in which I had the privilege of ministering. Surely, in these respects, and in the adoption of the Scriptural precept, "Let all the people say Amen," our congregations might make an advance towards the realisation of the common worship.

But in all things we must be guided by the spirit of

wisdom. Any departure, however excellent, from long established usage, must be cautiously made, and so made as to secure the sympathy of the intelligent and devout in the congregation. And this, at all events, we who are called to interpret the souls who worship with us may lay to heart—that it is our duty so to study God, the soul, our world, ourselves, so to steep our minds in all highest and deepest things, so to live in the atmosphere of prayer, as to qualify us for articulating, in the most becoming and appropriate manner possible, "the motion of a hidden fire that trembles in the breast."

III

Finally, it goes without saying that beyond all other desiderata of congregational worship there is that of spiritual life and life abundant.

The apostle connects the inspirations of worship with a fulness of the spirit. Where there is this fulness there will be the rhythm and the music of psalm and hymn and spiritual song, a melody in the heart that shall ripple up in melodious word, an overflowing thankfulness for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Vitality and vivacity are ever in companionship. Why is it that our congregations so often present an aspect dull, *triste*, wanting in brightness and force in their acts of worship? The *why* of all whys is the want of vitality, the low temperature of the Christian life, the leanness and scantiness of the spiritual joy. We are not rejoicing in the Lord "with a joy unspeakable and full of glory." Men introduce elaborate rituals; well, we desire a seemly and dignified ritual; but elaboration in things outward will never produce the worship in spirit and in truth. The æsthetic has its place in the showing forth of God's most worthy praise, for the beautiful and the devout are in closest relation. There is the beauty of holiness; there is also the holiness of beauty. But the æsthetic, separated from the spiritual, introduced merely for its own sake, may

be a great snare. Without the deep spiritual consciousness, the rich external worship may be little better than a decorous unreality; the unreality all the more perilous that it is decorous; served up (in Augustine's phase) "in dainty dishes that may cover a banquet of delusions." Yes; what a great writer says as to our day applies to our worship: "It is less Christianity, more Christ, that we want." More Christ in the ministry and its pulpits, more Christ in our membership and in all that is suggested by the pew. "Come, Holy Spirit, Creator come, and visit all the souls of Thine." In the day of His power, in the fire-baptism to which reference was made yesterday, congregational worship shall be radiant, the upspringing of fountains whose seat is within, a fulness that shall overflow all the banks of special time and season, fertilising the whole environment of the life, and realising the poet's vision of Sundays and week-days which receive their light from the day that celebrates a risen Christ. Sundays "An Easter day in every week."

> "And week-days following in their train
> The fulness of Thy blessing gain,
> Till all, both resting and employ,
> Be one Lord's day of holy joy."

Rev. G. W. Sprott, D.D.—In this paper I cannot do much more than speak of the number of our church services. The first Book of Discipline enjoins two services on Sunday, and requires the minister to catechise the children at the afternoon service on a part of Calvin's Catechism, and to explain the doctrine contained therein. This was the standing rule till Knox's Liturgy was superseded by the Directory. During these eighty-six years the reader's service, consisting of prayer, singing, and Scripture reading, lasted from nine till ten, when the minister began his work. The afternoon service commenced at one. When a parish was vacant, or the minister absent or ill, the reader discharged his duties as usual, and people were required to be present just as when sermons were preached.

After the adoption of the Directory, as the reader's office was then abolished, the minister was enjoined to begin his service half an hour earlier than before to give him time for the reading and exposition of Scripture. The Directory allowed him when he thought fit to expound any part of what had been read after the reading was finished. This permission was treated by our church as an obligation, and this was the beginning of lecturing and preaching at the same service. Almost from 1646, when the attempt was made to begin the use of the Directory, till the end of the Covenanting era, the Church and country were in a state of anarchy, and there was great confusion and disorder in the conduct of public worship, but the Assembly, till Cromwell turned it out of doors, and Synods and Presbyteries afterwards, required both a lecture and a sermon in the forenoon, and a lecture with catechising and the teaching of catechetical doctrine in the afternoon.

During the second Episcopacy (1661-1688), the reading of Scripture was resumed by the precentor or schoolmaster, and ministers were forbidden both to lecture and preach at the same service. They might expound a large portion of Scripture, but this was to be the sermon for the time. The Presbyterial visitation of parishes and the Synodical trial of Presbyteries went on as before, and the questions asked always included this one—Is there preaching each Lord's Day both forenoon and afternoon?

When the Presbyterian Government was restored in 1690 there were only about a hundred and thirty ministers to carry it on, and for years many churches were shut for weeks at a time. But as soon as the Church was again fully manned, the following questions were prescribed for Presbyterial visitations—"Doth the minister lecture and preach in the forenoon and preach again in the afternoon both summer and winter?" "Doth he preach ordinarily catechetical doctrine in the afternoon?" But very soon, for the first time I believe in our Reformed Church, the second service began to be discontinued in country parishes

in winter. A few months after Boston's ordination in 1699, he writes, "I visited one of my neighbouring brethren with whom I found not the affection I wished for. My preaching twice on the Lord's Day in winter was reckoned unneighbourly"; and Stewart of Pardovna, in 1709, says that the law requiring two services on Sunday was too much neglected. As the brethren became more neighbourly the contagion spread, and by the end of the century Gerard of Aberdeen represents it as the ordinary custom in rural parishes to have two services in summer but only one in winter. Liston, in his "Service of the House of God," published in 1843, mentions that during winter in the country public worship was completed at one meeting. The afternoon service in summer, still the rule at that time, has since, except in a very few parishes, vanished away. The next step was to abolish one of the two discourses, well-nigh universal, at the single service. This was done gradually, and a common stage in the process was to divide the sermon into two by singing a few verses in the middle, but now one short discourse is the rule in most country, and in some town parishes. In cities it was long a custom to have both a lecture and a sermon in the forenoon, but one of the two is now no more, and the Assembly sanctioned the omission a few years ago by ceasing to require ministers who officiated before it both to lecture and preach. The double-barrelled method necessarily cut down the devotions and fostered ideas of worship like those of the American, who, after an episcopal service, remarked that it was a very long time before the minister got to business.

From a return made to the Assembly in 1890 by 832 ministers,—and those who did not make the return are not likely to have been more zealous than their brethren,—it appears that 422 had only one regular service on Sunday, though 230 of these had a second more or less frequently in some part of the parish. There are places where you find a parish church with only one service and a dissenting place

of worship hard by with two, and a collegiate church with only one service, taken by the two ministers on alternate Sundays, is not unexampled, not to speak of Plymouth Brethren being called in to officiate at the funerals of Church people, owing to the absence of their own pastors. In many Highland parishes where there were once two services, the Gaelic one has been given up. At the recent Church Congress in London, the services in a bilingual Welsh parish with one minister were described as follows :— At 8 A.M., Holy Communion in Welsh or English ; 10 A.M., Morning Prayer and Sermon in Welsh ; 11.15 A.M., Morning Prayer and Sermon in English ; 3 P.M., Evening Prayer and Sermon in Welsh or English. This was made a plea for additional help, not because the work was too much for one man, but because the services were insufficient, and the result indifference, or attendance at dissenting chapels. The latest reduction is the closing, or partial closing, of city churches in summer, when, though many of the ordinary worshippers are from home, the hotels are full of strangers. Thus have our Church services grown small by degrees—I cannot say beautifully less—and this diminution has been going on while the Church of England has been multiplying its services exceedingly. In many Scottish parishes there is now a minimum of worship never before reached in Christendom, which would not be tolerated at any of our foreign mission stations, and which makes it impossible for a large part of the population to attend church more than once a fortnight.

I can only refer to the giving up of daily morning and evening prayer once offered in all our towns and villages, with sermons once or twice during the week. These week-day sermons were continued in many villages during last century. And as for the Sacraments, public Baptism, once a cardinal principle of Presbyterianism, is now all but unknown in two-thirds of our country parishes, and according to the return of 1890, Holy Communion was celebrated in 102 parishes only once in the year, in

579 twice, in 42 thrice, in 64 four times, and in 3 five times. If it be true as is sometimes said that the Scots are no longer a devotional people, the Church is largely responsible for it.

It is the old story, there is no King in Israel and every one does what is right in his own eyes. It is high time we had an efficient executive which is the one thing essential in all forms of government and that we began to recover lost ground.

The Assembly, in my opinion, should insist upon a second Sunday service in every parish, daily prayer in one or more churches in all our towns, at least one week-day service in every parish, public baptism, except for a good and necessary cause, and the celebration of the Holy Communion at least quarterly which the Synod of Glasgow overtured the Assembly to enjoin 160 years ago. Sunday schools and Bible classes have taken the place of catechising to which ministers were long obliged to devote one day in the week. Still, it would be an immense advantage if the country clergy would restore the catechetical service on Sunday afternoons, and if their city brethren would catechise their Sunday school children on revision day and frequently at other times.

In many parishes this standard has not only been reached but exceeded, and what is wanted in the first place is to bring the rest into line.

Extra services may be more or less desirable, but in a national church all that is essential and reasonable in the way of church services and clerical work, should be steadily maintained in every parish. This is implied in our contract with the State, not to speak of higher obligations.

Discussion.

The Very Rev. Donald Macleod, D.D., in opening the discussion, said—I do not mean to discuss the papers you have just heard; both of them are extremely helpful

regarding some of the questions respecting the forms of worship, but I would just give my brethren this advice—whatever you develop, let it be on our own Scotch root. We have got our own historical past, our own national traditions, and what we have to do is not to import, but to make more suitable and more beautiful that which belongs to ourselves and our historical past. Instead of entering on any discussion of these subjects, I wish specially to touch on the question of mission services for the people. You have to deal with a very large and a very sad proportion of the people of the country, who are standing aloof from all Churches. There are different proportions. Our brethren in country parishes have their own proportion. Many farm servants and other workers seldom darken the church door. In towns and cities we have different classes. Our intelligent artisan class, who are engaged keenly in questions of political economy, and so on, while holding formally to Christianity and devotion to Christ, have lost a certain amount of that sympathy they once had with Church and congregational life. Many are not coming to our churches. What they need is not what can be attained by services, but by the Church of Christ showing more the spirit of Christ in active everyday life. Most of the questions between labour and capital might be solved by the practical display of Christian spirit. It is where you find in the battle of life that which is a contrast to the ideals of Christianity that you discover one of the causes that are separating so many of our people from our Church work. But then you have the other class, the lapsed, the submerged tenth. You have got drunkenness. Thank God for everything that is being done to solve that question in any way. There is no question more vital for Home Missions than the temperance question, and how the vice of drunkenness is to be reached. What I feel is that the real central power for producing reformation, while enormously aided by external things, must be the winning of the hearts of the people by the gospel.

Another thing I wish to say is regarding those who are sunk. What kind of service are you to have for the very poor, the outsiders, the submerged tenth? You must try to get suitable services for these people. I have in the General Assembly spoken, and speak here again, as to the necessity for special services. One thing you must have is a proper hymnal, suited for these people. Your hymnal or hymnary is far too stiff both in words and music for reaching them. You ought to issue an evangelistic hymnal suitable for this class, who need something like what they find elsewhere, and which has proved such an immense power. No one can estimate the power which the hymns of the Salvation Army and other organisations of that kind have upon the people. They sing them, march with them, and feel these hymns have a power that no mere address possesses. We ought to have something like that. As regards services for the people, that is a tremendously difficult question. I recognise the very earnest, the very effective work done by many of our licentiates who are labouring among the poor, but at the same time a licentiate is a licentiate, and he is naturally looking forward to obtaining a parish. There are certain modern inventions which are a great trial to licentiates in the shape of leets, and the man's mind is divided between the work he is doing temporarily and the desire to find a place in some leet. That is natural, but it is not the healthiest thing for mission work among the people. Our work among the lapsed masses necessarily suffers thereby and lacks concentration and permanence. Another point is that we must have more elastic ideas about our agencies in dealing with these people. We must recollect the charismata—the diversity of gifts—with which the Holy Ghost dwelling in the Church enriches the Church. We must try to find out God-given people among us, with special graces for developing the work of the mission. In the matter of preaching, for instance, I wish we had a little more elasticity. I have often felt that it would be a help in some of our mission gatherings if there

was given a place for the people themselves to speak. One of the biggest powers in connection with the Salvation Army—and the Salvation Army has many lessons to teach us—is that working men get up and give their experience, and speak straight from the heart. When a man does that, the people feel there is something in it of reality. Why should we not do something to get hold of people of that kind to speak out of their own experience and out of their hearts? Let us realise and recognise the functions God has bestowed upon others as well as upon ourselves. Then we ought to develop women's gifts and powers in dealing with these classes. There is a peculiar power in a woman who has the gift of speech. You remember Dinah in "Adam Bede." That is what I mean, and you have got the Dinahs going about Glasgow just now. We have not many such recognised in our Church. When I am going to my church on Sundays I sometimes stand at Charing Cross to listen to a Salvation Army service, and it has gone to my heart to see some of those women coming forward and to hear them speaking with longing, yearning tenderness. At such times I have thought—Could we not do something like this?—is there not someone among us to rise up and speak to the poor people as these do in the streets of Glasgow? You must try and make the meetings suitable for the people you have to deal with—get the right agents, get people baptised with the spirit of the God of love, above everything tenderness and sympathy, and do not confine it merely to ministers, but get the help of God's people, wherever they are, to bear testimony at such meetings. This is a tremendous subject. Do we realise the thousands and tens of thousands lying outside our Churches, and the sin, misery, and dissoluteness affecting many of our great cities? How are we to reach them? I do not think we are reaching them except in the very slightest way at present. The work is a mere touching of the surface. We have been unable to reach and gather many home; but if the Church is to reach the people,

it must bring its best thought to bear on finding the best methods, and ministers should think how to make things attractive so as to bring in and win the people. The following things are part of that which should form our aim. First, suitable services as regards the hymns the people have to sing. You must have the best music possible for mission meetings. If anthems do any good you may have them. I know they do me good. I know they have a great power over many people. But that is not all that you want. You want a warm atmosphere, hymns in which they are carried away with good hearty singing, a strong choir, and we must not leave the mission without the things that help ourselves. Then the meetings must be made as free as you can, and you must give an opportunity to the people who desire to tell from their own experience the great things God has done for them.

Professor COOPER said that, as Convener of the Programme Committee, he had to apologise for the absence at this stage of the meeting of one who was extremely and deservedly venerated in the Church throughout the land. Mr J. A. Campbell of Stracathro was, through illness, unable to be present, and they all deeply sympathised with him. With reference to the subject they were considering, he thought there was no National Church which gave more liberty to its clergy in the matter of services than the Church of Scotland. It would be rash to say that this liberty was not sometimes abused, but they would agree with him when he said he would like to see this liberty more *used*. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." But liberty to do what? Not to withhold, not to neglect; but to give, and to invent. In the Parable of the Good Samaritan, the Lord describes under the figure of the innkeeper the duty of the Church. The "two pence"—the Word and Sacraments—it would be fraud for the innkeeper to keep back. But over and above the two pence, there was to be room for the innkeeper's invention. "Whatsoever thou spendest *more*

when I come again, I will repay thee." Alas! we have been niggardly even in regard to the "two pence," which we cannot without fraud withhold. Dr Sprott had told them of a shameful state of matters in Scotland—the worship of God reduced to a *minimum* in many parishes, and His ordinances administered and distributed with the greatest niggardliness. There were whole classes of the community for whom little or nothing was done. Dr Macleod had spoken of the spiritual needs of those who did not go to church. Surely the ministers of the Church ought to do aggressive work. He could not agree with Dr Macleod in regard to many of the things he had just recommended; but they ought certainly, as far as possible, to have open-air preaching by ministers. He remembered Dr Macleod recommending in the Assembly that they should wear gown and bands when they went to the streets to preach. He had done so himself, and found that the people rejoiced that ministers of the Church had come to preach to them. He thought it would do no harm to the regular congregation if sometimes the service was held on the street or on the hillside on the afternoon of a summer day. They were too hide-bound in the day and hour of their services, and there was a want of variety. They had no service, as a rule, except on Sundays: their Sunday services were mostly at the same hours, and the evening service was just a repetition of the morning one. The *Church Times* had spoken of "the Undecimarian Heresy" —the notion that the only lawful time to worship God was on Sunday forenoon at eleven o'clock. That heresy seemed too prevalent in Scotland. Then they had to consider the needs of minorities. There were minorities who could not attend either of their ordinary services. The hours must be inconvenient for a considerable number. Let them not be afraid if the congregation, at first, was small. Its scanty attendance may be the result of previous neglect —a sign that we have need to "work up" some district. But a service attended by a small congregation might be

as full of the presence of God as a large one, and very helpful. No doubt, in a large congregation they could have a fuller outburst of song, while in a small congregation the singing was necessarily thinner and poor, but much might be done, by a judicious use of responses, to make up for this, as for example by the alternate reading of the Psalms; while, if the people joined in the Lord's Prayer and Creed, and learned some simple versicles by heart, great spiritual benefit might accrue. There ought to be more freedom in the form of their services as well as a greater number and variety. Again, when there were only one or two celebrations of Holy Communion during the year, a large number of people in the parish could not possibly communicate; and there were cases of sailors, soldiers, and fishermen who were absent on these occasions. In the Minutes of the Town Council of Aberdeen, shortly after the time of the Reformation (I think under the ministry of John Craig, the next in importance to Knox himself among the Reformers of our Church), it is recorded that the Town Council provided bread and wine for the Holy Communion, so that certain shipfuls of mariners going to sea should receive the Sacrament on a Thursday before starting on their voyage. Glasgow had the other day been stirred to an unwonted enthusiasm by large numbers of troops going on a long voyage to what was already a terrible war. Was any provision made by the Church to give the soldiers before they went an opportunity of receiving the Holy Communion, or were any special prayers offered for and with them?[1] Surely they were neglecting their duty in these respects. Again, every Professor of Divinity must feel very deeply the lack of provision for the spiritual needs of a class who ought to be particularly cared for, their Divinity students. At Aberdeen the Principal of the University had gone to the Presbytery and obtained permission to have an annual Celebration for the

[1] I have learned that, subsequent to the Congress, the Minister of Govan offered to hold a special service, but his offer was declined.—J. C.

students in King's College Chapel there; and he was glad to say that in Glasgow Dr Macleod had kindly celebrated Holy Communion for the benefit of the Glasgow students in the Park Church at the close of last session. Those who attended on that occasion felt the preciousness and the sweetness of the ordinance, and realised the Saviour's presence in it perhaps more than they might have done in a large congregation. When he saw an enormous congregation at a Communion he often doubted whether it was the best way to feel the presence of their Lord. The "breaking of bread" in Apostolic times was "from house to house" in small companies. Dr Macleod had also spoken of developing along national lines. Let them do this: only let them develop and not stick in the mud of slothfulness. He would suggest one method. There was a day which would be soon upon them—a day on which Scotsmen abroad met to inflame their patriotism, by toast and song, and recollections of their native land—St Andrew's Day. Their soldiers in South Africa would be keeping that day. Ought not their parents, pastors, and friends at home to gather together that day, "offer up sacrifices according to the number of them all" (Job i. 5) with prayers and supplications that their sons' love of country might be sanctified by the love of God, and that they might remember not only the songs of their native land but the songs of Zion, and the prayers they learned at their mothers' knee? If their countrymen abroad knew that they were gathering together to pray for them, would it not bind them together in a close and sacred bond? He counselled fuller consideration, and thought and care for the different conditions and positions of their people, and a multiplication of the means of grace, so that those who were at present unable to come might have opportunities of doing so, and that those who did come might be more richly fed.

Rev. R. M'Clelland, Inchinnan, said he was surprised to hear it said that it would be a desirable thing if

congregations were induced to join in the Lord's Prayer. He thought very few congregations in the Church of Scotland were not at least educated up to the point to think that was a desirable thing. Were they really hoping too much when they hoped the time would come, and that very soon, when there should be at least one prayer in the service of the Church which all the congregations should know, and in which all the congregation should join? He had come in contact with people of other denominations, and been impressed with the tremendous power that the repetition in Church of the prayer they had been accustomed to from childhood exercised over them throughout life, wherever their lot was cast. Another consideration was that God had special saints in the world who had great gifts for devotion and prayer. These prayers were pleasing to the divine ear when they were offered by the men themselves, and he could not but think, all unworthy as they were to use the prayers of those saints, that when used by them they would be still pleasing in the ear of the Lord, and would bring them into contact with the whole of Christianity. It would make them feel that they all belonged to one Church and were united to common Christendom. It was a mistake to suppose that in any well-ordered Church the gifts and graces of God were confined to the clergy. All Churches that had shown wisdom had taken men and women into Orders—they might be inferior Orders—but by that system they gathered up the whole strength and devotion of the Church.

Rev. James Paton, St Paul's, Glasgow, said the previous speaker had remarked that he thought there were surely few congregations that were not educated at least to the feeling that they ought to join audibly in the Lord's Prayer. He wished from his heart that were true, but as matter of personal experience he wished to say there were many congregations within hail of this hall where the proposal to join audibly in the Lord's Prayer would split the congregation. He had pleaded for this in his own congregation,

and had been obliged to withdraw his plea simply because some of the best men of the Church did not feel that it was for the welfare of the congregation to join audibly in the Lord's Prayer. There was nothing they should more regret than that the introduction of even so beautiful a portion of the service as that should be the means of defeating the ends of congregational life—namely, unity of the spirit in prayer to God. He wished to say a word in regard to Home Mission services for the people. Dr Donald Macleod said that a mission hymnal was highly requisite. He had no objection to a mission hymnal with the Church's imprimatur, but he wanted them to recognise facts. The Hymnary had 120 hymns specially selected for mission services among the people, and but for that it would not be so large as it was. The plea of some of them was that they wanted to get rid of all the hymn-books used in their various meetings, and to substitute the Hymnary. These hymns were acceptable to the people where they were known. If they continued to train their working people now outside the Church to sing songs and solos of any mission hymnal which they did not meet with when they came to the Church, they would erect a barrier between the mission people and the people in the Church. He had tried to work with the Salvation Army, and he had no disparaging word to utter. As matter of experience, however, the Salvation Army did not lay hold of the outlying people in the city any more than the organised churches did. The reason was a credit to Glasgow. The reason was that the evangelistic work of Glasgow was being to a great extent done already. In this way the Salvation Army had not the same material to work upon as they had in many other cities. As matter of experience he did not find in the centre of Glasgow that any of these external organisations or spasmodic efforts of any kind had touched the people in their homes, or brought the people to the Church, any more than the Church itself had. He would look on the man as lifting the biggest burden from his

life who would show him how to bring the gospel to the poor most effectually. It was a terrible problem, but they would not meet it by changing the organisation, or by having a different class of workers, or having a different costume. They would never meet the problem until they stirred their congregation man for man, woman for woman —not to go to halls or the corner of streets, though that was admirable and worthy of all praise, but to the fireside, and to sit with the people at their hearth and to plead with them for God's sake and their children's sake to rise to a higher life. That was the solution of the difficulty—man to man and heart to heart in their own home, in the presence of the children. They would win them there, or they would never win them at all.

Mr ROBERT WALKER, Glasgow, said that as a layman he was delighted to hear the remarks that had fallen from Mr Paton, and he cordially agreed with them. Dr Macleod seemed to think, for mission purposes, only hymns and tunes that were of a special character were suitable, and that the tunes should be those heard by the lapsed masses in other places. Now, he had heard those hymns of a special character sung to tunes which were heard elsewhere, and his impression was that they did more than anything else to prevent the people having anything to do with Christianity. He had heard one of these hymns sung to the tune "Not for Joe." Would singing hymns like that ever bring people into the folds of Christianity?

Dr MACLEOD said he never intended that they should adopt hymns of that sort. He suggested that the matter should be dealt with by a Committee of the Church, who would have the sense to select the most appropriate words and tunes.

Mr WALKER, resuming, said that Dr Macleod had referred to meetings at street corners and other places, and he understood him to mean that they were to have similar meetings and similar hymns. Something had been said about individual testimony being given. He did not

consider it did anything for the spread of Christ's kingdom on earth. The language used by many of the testifiers was disgraceful, and was likely to produce an impression upon the young that the best way to become good and have hopes of heaven was by being as bad as possible just now. He had one word of warning about the matters brought up at this Congress. If the Church was to recommend co-operative stores to their sympathies, then the clergy must set the example to their congregations and become members of the stores. Now, as a layman, he looked on his clergyman as a moral guide and his spiritual adviser; but if he became a partner of a co-operative store his minister then became, in addition to a moral guide and spiritual adviser, a competitor in the trade of butcher, shoemaker, or any other business in which he was engaged. If the Church was to identify itself with the co-operative movement, instead of working for the building up and extending of God's kingdom on earth, it would introduce a source of discord into their congregations.

Mr J. Ness, Whiteinch, testified to the great service rendered to their church by the Mission Weeks Committee. In a large parish in an industrial centre of Glasgow there had been a three weeks' mission held recently, and at the subsequent Communion 120 members joined the Church, one third of them being attributed directly to the mission services held in the parish. At one of the week's missions two evangelists working in connection with the Temperance Committee of the Church were present, and 200 people took the pledge. That showed that the Church had an organisation for doing that mission work, and that all of them should try to take advantage of it. As refuting in some measure what his lay brother had said, he had the privilege of attending a twenty minutes' service at the meal-hour the other day, when an address was given by a carpenter who had been converted eighteen years ago. The carpenter went about the country and had been the instrument through God, by personal testimony of what

Jesus Christ had done for his soul, of bringing many men and women who would otherwise never have been brought into Christ's kingdom. Working men understood that ministers were obliged to preach twice every Sabbath, but they thought the clergy were really in earnest when they went to the street corners and proclaimed the Gospel. He would like every minister who was suited for it to take up that work.

Rev. Professor KENNEDY said he rose to make a practical suggestion. They had represented in this gathering a class of men, servants of the Church, who had not yet been mentioned. Various ministers had spoken and the Moderator had appealed for the testimony of laymen. Now, they had with them a body of men whose voices they could not hear in the Assembly when the Home Mission work came up for discussion—men who were doing the great bulk of Home Mission work—he meant their licentiates. He suggested that the Moderator should ask some of those who were doing aggressive work throughout the country if they could give them any suggestions as to new methods they had found in the working of their meetings. He felt that some of the views already expressed were of a retrogressive kind; the speakers' ideals lay too much in the past. He liked to look forward with more hope to the future. Society was changing rapidly. Society was face to face with new conditions, and he looked to the class he had mentioned as the most likely to find the means of meeting them.

Rev. N. M. MACFIE, Tighnabruaich, said they were all very anxious to see the people take part in the Church services, but he did not find in their Presbyterian traditions that there was a readiness to adopt any innovation of that nature. A speaker had said that in every congregation of the Church one might think they would have had a consensus of opinion as to the desirability of the Lord's Prayer being repeated. He was afraid that was not so; he wished it were. Another speaker said that, seeing they could not get the people to join in the services and make responses,

they should get them to join in the way of united singing. He thought there was a danger at the present day of the singing being in too elaborate a form, so that congregations could not join in it. The whole congregation were deprived of taking that part in the service which would be possible if congregational singing were given instead of anthems.

Rev. W. BROWNLIE, Lenzie, said there was a tendency in congregational singing to overlook the splendid old Scotch psalm tunes, and it was a remarkable fact that there were very few organists who were capable of interpreting those tunes, or else they were not willing to do so. The organ ought to be an accompaniment, and nothing else. Then these old Scotch tunes were sung far too fast—they should be sung in the time of the German chorale. He also hoped that by and by congregations might be trained to join in chanting. The members of the Congress who had attended the service in the Cathedral on the previous day would agree with him that the psalm was exceedingly well chanted, the words being distinctly uttered. He thought the Congress would set its face against what were called services of praise. They were entitled to call them Sunday evening concerts if they liked, but he was one of those old-fashioned people who believed that a Sunday evening concert under the guise of a service of praise would not bring the slightest addition to the strength of the Church. Then he was not sure that it was a justifiable thing to have what were called Sunday evening topical sermons. They had in the west of Scotland some remarkable titles for evening sermons, and he would protest against those evening sermons, if it could be done without calling undue attention to them. He would be glad if the Congress would use its influence in putting them down. The Gospel had not lost its power. They should, therefore, keep as far as possible just on the old lines.

Rev. D. WATSON, Woodside, Glasgow, said that some appeared to have a difficulty about getting the congregation to repeat the Lord's Prayer as part of the service. For

twenty years he had taken upon himself the responsibility of the religious education of the young in his congregation. He trained the children in the responsive services, and when these children grew up there was no difficulty in introducing those desirable changes in his church.

Rev. Dr HUNTER, Galashiels, said he agreed with Mr Watson that if they were to have a bright and interesting service it must be by training the children to take part in it properly. He thought that even Sunday School work was not properly done unless there was a service in which the children could be taught to join reverently and with interest. He had taken charge of his own Sunday School for five years. Before he had gone far, he discovered that most of the children never came to church at all, so he set himself to make the Sunday School a training place for the public worship of God. The children were trained to sing the hymns that were used in the church; he went even further and said that the psalms of David were better hymns, and he had taken great delight in teaching them the old metrical version. Every Sunday they repeated the psalm together, and then they joined in singing it. The result was that his children's service now was the best and brightest and most interesting service that was held in his parish. He was pleased to think that the future was being provided for, as the children were trained to take a most reverent part in the service. He did not allow them to stare up at the minister, but insisted on their heads being bowed. He thought it was disgraceful that, in their congregations, so many people should sit staring up at the minister during prayer. He had no difficulty in getting the children to say the Lord's Prayer; they went further, and repeated the Creed with him. If there was to be any training, it was not a question of training the congregation, but of training the children.

Rev. JOHN EDGAR, Milngavie, said it did not appear to him that there was any general movement in the Church of Scotland to reach the point when there would be repeti-

tion of the Lord's Prayer or some stereotyped prayer. It was only so in the hands of the very few who were striving to foist upon the Church the practices of other Churches. He was surprised to hear men saying that they used their Sunday Schools as training grounds for the introduction into Scottish Presbyterian churches of practices that belonged to the Anglican Church. It was the opinion of the large majority in the Scottish Church that they were going much too far towards a movement which had nothing to do with Presbyterianism at all. Their chief duty was to carry out Church government and Church services according to the traditions of their fathers in the Presbyterian Church.

The Rev. H. J. WOTHERSPOON said that under the common term "preaching" we included two specifically different forms of ministry. In Holy Scripture a broad distinction was drawn between, on the one hand, the proclamation of the gospel—the heralding of the Lord Jesus Christ—to those who did not know Him, or to those who did not regard; and on the other hand, what was in the New Testament called "Doctrine"—the teaching which was within the Church for the edification of its own faithful—or *paraclesis*, the "exhortation" which sought from them the fruits of repentance and faith. The proper differentiation of what they called by the general name of "services" must in one aspect of the question more or less follow the lines of this distinction. There was evangelisation; and there was that preaching which was part of the worship of Almighty God. He trusted that the Church of Scotland would never forget this view of the ordinance of preaching, which he had found nowhere so explicitly recognised as it was in her standards, that preaching is part of the act of worship. He deprecated the opposition which had sometimes been suggested between worship and preaching, and he deprecated the view that in worship the Word and Sacraments were competing elements, more or less mutually exclusive of each other. What

was worship but the setting forth before God of His own perfections and of His own mighty deeds: the reflection from man to God of His own image recreated in us and of His own revelation of Himself vouchsafed to us? Whatever the act of worship was—whether it was that prayer which lays out before God in intercession His own most gracious purpose in humanity, or the hymn which sets forth for God's praise the Redemptive work of the Lord, or whether it was the triumphant declaration by the Church of those things of which it was her joy to proclaim "I believe it," or whether it was the Memorial before the Father of Christ's own offering of Himself for us—what was it but the showing forth before the Almighty of Himself, and of His own will realised in us? To praise God was only to tell what God has done. In this view the preaching of the Word was properly part of worship. Preaching which set forth the act of God, the love of God, what God is and what is His eternal purpose—that alone was preaching as it should be so named by the Church as part of her Divine service. As for the relation in worship of Word and Sacrament, we should keep in mind the intimate connection which preaching of this type had always held to the celebration of the Eucharist. We must remember that the very origin of the sermon as part of stated service was as part of the sacramental service. By practice, ancient as the Church herself, when the Holy Communion was celebrated the Word was read, and next the Word was spoken. So it had been from the beginning. The sermon was as proper a part of the sacramental service as anything of the immemorial framework which Christian reverence had gathered round the celebration itself. They should remember the reverent phrase of their fathers, which named it the *Action* sermon. And when he thought of those who had pled with the Church to give a more proportionate place in her service to the Holy Communion, and when he thought of the personal relation of these men to the ordinance of preaching, he could not feel that there had

been any tendency in their pleadings to set these two parts of worship in antagonism. Although they had desired the Children's Bread in its season, they had not underrated the joy of speaking by the living word those same things which in the Sacrament are shown to the praise of God the Father. As for the evangelistic aspect of preaching, he hoped that this Congress would not pass without greater emphasis being laid upon that as part of the proper work of the Church. There was need of a more deliberate recognition of her office in that respect, both towards the unevangelised world of heathendom, and also towards those within her own territory who were indifferent to her message. We had reason to be thankful for the organised evangelisation which in the form of special mission weeks had in our own time become a feature of our parish life. East end parish or west end, there was room for such work and need of it, and he for one could not think that any parish had reached an adequate organisation of its life, which did not know how and when to avail itself of such specialised effort. As to agencies for evangelisation, those could not be limited to the ordained ministry. He had no wish to make anyone an offender for a word, but he felt that he must emphatically differ from the statement of a former speaker that any section of the Church of Scotland, held the view that, "the Charismata were confined to the clergy." He remembered at a time when schemes of reform, which deliberately embraced proposals for the extension of lay agency and the training of lay evangelists, were in contemplation, he had spoken of this to Dr John Macleod, the Convener of the then existing Reform Committee, and he remembered the passionate vehemence of the assent which Dr Macleod gave to the remark that it seemed a grievous and incredible thing that the Holy Spirit should give the Church men with specific gifts for actual need, and that she should be unable to utilise these or give them scope unless on condition of a six years' university training, and the provision of a proportionate in-

come. If the counsels then submitted to the Church had been accepted and carried out, an important step towards the solution of the problem of adequate evangelistic agency would have been taken, and our difficulties to-day would be less than they are. And until action should be taken on their lines our work at home for the indifferent and lapsed must remain crippled.

Mr ANDREW THOMSON, Glendinning School, Galashiels, said he did not think with one of the speakers that the training of the children to repeat the Lord's Prayer was leading them on the way to Rome. Not only had Dr Hunter got the children to repeat the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, but the whole congregation sympathised with the services, and many attended them. Dr Hunter had also a service for the young, and it would be a help to many ministers if they had such children's services. As to the sermon, he believed it to be an important part of the Church service. At the same time, there was some benefit in advertising a sermon, as they knew the subject on which they were to be addressed. Then he regarded the reading of the Word of God as an important part. The Minister might make a selection for a year, and print it, so that those who were unable to be present might be able to read the same portion as those who might be in the church.

Rev. H. J. DICK, Glasgow, said that one great thing they should aim at was to secure the attendance of the masses at evening service on the Sabbath. What was wanted was to get to the hearts of the people, and, besides, they would never get the masses to come to the church so long as there was a clear distinction between two classes in the church. That was the sore point with the great mass of the people with whom he had come in contact. He believed the mind of the Scottish people was such that they rebelled against charity, against anything that would lower them in any way relative to church services on the Sunday. It was degrading the people, and hindering the work of

the Church, to talk of a mission, and call the man who was to preach to them a missionary. If they called the place a church, the work would be greater and more effectual. The people should be made to feel that they are a living part of the whole Church of Scotland.

Very Rev. Dr SCOTT, Edinburgh, who was called upon by the Moderator, said he was grateful for the success that had attended the institution of this Congress. He could look sufficiently far into the future to realise how by means of it the proper business of the General Assembly would be greatly lightened while the great interests of the Church would be more thoroughly attended to, in such annual gatherings as the present. He had learned a great deal since Dr Sprott spoke. They had elicited not only the opinions, but the convictions of brethren who had formed them through considerable experience. What they wanted was the gathering up of their experience, and bringing it to bear on the great interests of the Church. They had been discussing some of the great necessities in the Church to-day, in an admirable spirit, although now and again there was a tendency to run into detail. He did not wish to err in this direction. Great stress had been laid on the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, and upon the introduction of the Creed, and other things, into the service. Now, they would not make much advance though they got every congregation in the Church to repeat the Lord's Prayer; it might be no reform at all; but what he would aim at was to get every member of the Church to pray the Lord's Prayer, and to believe the Creed. This brought him to the other point. He thought that Dr Lang's paper might be summed up in this, that the great desiderata were living men to lead the worship of living congregations. Given these two factors, the worship of the Church would soon be reformed and adapted to our present necessities. They must wait on the great Head of the Church that He would give them these two desiderata—living men and living congregations. They did not need new methods.

In some respects their methods had been laid down by the Master Himself. They were not called in this complex age, so far as he could see, to deal with very many new difficulties, new dangers, and new opposition. The foes besetting the Church of Jesus Christ to-day were precisely the foes that St Paul had to face in his age, and he had only one way of facing them, and by that way he overcame them. He preached the ever new gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and if the gospel were preached by a living man, a man whom the gospel had laid hold of, his congregation would never weary of his sermon. It was the same with other parts of worship. If a living man threw his whole soul into the reading of the Word of God—and that was as effectual for the conversion of souls as the preaching of the Word—he would find that this part of the service was not in vain. Passages were not to be selected haphazard. We should study the Bible ourselves, and get into its spirit; then we would find that the people would always be pleased and profited by our reading. He was at one with Dr Macleod in saying that they must not stereotype the worship of the Church. It was good to have one service in which there would be followed an order of sequence common over the Church, but there should be a great deal of liberty in the methods that were adopted in regard to the other services. Many poor people were awed and appalled by the sight of their churches; they were not at home in them. For some who had never been at church it would simply be overwhelming to be brought into their congregations. We must meet them, give them a homelier, more familiar service to begin with, but never lose sight of the fact that our aim was to bring them to sit down with us at the Holy Table of the Lord. He thanked God that the Salvation Army had recalled to the Church of Scotland the militant idea of the Church. The Church Militant of which they professed they were members—where did it exist in the parishes of Scotland? If the militant church existed

at all, it was as a skeleton army consisting of officers only, but without rank and file. He did not think their battles in South Africa would ever be won if the officers were to do the whole of the fighting. The Salvation Army sought to create an Army of Christian workers. It expected every Christian man and woman to take a share in the great work of conquering the enemies of the Lord Jesus Christ, and until that had got into the hearts and consciences of the people, there would never be much advance on the part of the Church against the kingdom of Satan in this world.

The MODERATOR said he believed there was just one feeling in this crowded Meeting, and that was that they had had that morning an excellent session of Congress, excellently begun by Dr Lang, and excellently finished by Dr Scott. Twenty members of Congress had taken part in their proceedings, and the discussion had thrown light on the various questions brought before them and helped them as ministers.

THE CHURCH: ITS OBLIGATION TO ITS PARISHES.

Papers.

Rev. Norman Macleod, D.D.—It is obvious that the title of this paper, "The Church: its obligations to its Parishes," must be understood in a restricted sense. At first sight it may appear to include almost every function for which the Church exists, covering very nearly the whole field of its operations. But I assume that it is intended in this connection to emphasise the term *parish* as distinguished from the narrower term *congregation*—the fact, in other words, that the Church of Scotland is organised on a territorial basis. It is from this point of view that I propose to deal with it as far as may be possible in the brief time at my disposal.

I hope it may not be deemed irrelevant to remark at the outset that there is an obligation to its parishes that might be more adequately discharged by the Church, than it now is, through its *courts*—especially the Presbytery. I am well aware that in some quarters there is a repugnance more or less pronounced to what is called "Presbyterial Superintendence." In many instances I believe that this is largely due to prejudice or misconception. It is taken for granted that the sole object of a "Visitation" must necessarily be to discover something that is wrong, and inquisitorially to pry into the relations of minister, office-bearers, and people. The practice of modern times has a tendency to lead men to associate "Visitation" with some sort of initial judicial procedure. At all events, there is a disposition greatly

to underrate the help, guidance, and encouragement which might be afforded by a wise exercise of the power which the Constitution of the Church has undoubtedly conferred on its Presbyteries. Surely one of the most primary obligations of the Church is to see that its parishes are properly equipped and efficiently wrought. The possibility —which I do not deny—of an injudicious exercise of that power here or there cannot be regarded as a sufficient justification of the state of matters which now exists. I cannot for my part comprehend how such a state of matters can be regarded by anyone as satisfactory. Practically the Presbytery has ceased to intervene unless something of the nature of a scandal calls for its interference. Its "Episcopal" or supervisory authority is in large measure in abeyance. The great mass of the people hardly realise its existence, except in such circumstances as I have indicated, or on the occasion of an induction or ordination. The consideration of the "Queries or Presbyterial Superintendence" cannot be said to meet the necessities of the case, inasmuch as that method, even when followed with the utmost care and deliberation, does not bring the Presbytery into touch with its parishes. It does seem to me most desirable, one way or another, that there should be a more effective realisation of the responsibility of the Presbytery for the condition of all the parishes within its bounds in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters. An immense stimulus might thus be afforded to Church workers of every class; the hands of the ministers would, I believe, be strengthened; the evils of congregationalism would be diminished; the corporate life of the Church would be diffused more widely and much done every way to incite "unto love and good works." No one would wish to revive the superintendence of a former period, but a resuscitation (already begun in several Presbyteries), in a form adapted to the needs of our own time, and under such prudent regulations as experience may suggest, is urgently required, if not always by

ministers, assuredly by a large influential and increasing body of the laity.

But passing from this, it need scarcely be said that the obligation of the Church to its parishes must chiefly be fulfilled through the minister in co-operation with his elders and people. That the minister has a responsibility in relation to the whole *parish* and not to his *congregation* alone is a fundamental principle of the National Establishment. No doubt it is a responsibility that should always be discharged with a scrupulous regard to the conscientious convictions of those who belong to other branches of the Christian Church. Everything of the nature of proselytism is to be shunned. The zeal which compasses sea and land to make one proselyte is not the spirit that should actuate the ministers of a National Church. I venture to affirm that it is not a fault with which, as a class, they are chargeable. In my opinion a parish minister is not called upon to include in his regular pastoral visitation those who are known to be in fellowship with other churches. A friendly Christian intercourse with all his parishioners of every class and denomination he is bound to maintain to the utmost of his power, always subject to the conditions and terms laid down. But he is also bound to remember and to make it plain that every parishioner has a *right* to claim his services. This he can do without any undue interference or noisy assertion of his rights. By caring for the poor and suffering—by endeavouring to make the ministration of the Gospel commensurate with the needs of the whole population—by manifesting the sanctity of a holy life and the spirit of the Lord Jesus in His ministry to the souls and bodies of men—by helping every social and benevolent object, and, above all, by seeking for those who are as sheep without a shepherd—the ignorant, the careless and the vicious, he can show that neither his sympathy nor his duty is limited to those, be they few or many, who attend this ministry. In this matter the circumstances of town and country parishes are totally dis-

similar. The minister of a country parish of moderate size has this great advantage, that it is possible for him to know every individual man, woman, and child within its borders, and for this reason it is much easier for him than for town ministers to discharge his obligations to his parish as a whole. By means of cottage or kitchen meetings on Sabbath days and week days or other suitable services, he can easily reach a class who can hardly appreciate the stated ordinances of religion or are unable on account of distance and other causes to attend them with regularity. It is to be regretted, I think, that in the large cities especially the minister does not always reside within his parish or even in its immediate neighbourhood. Such non-residence cannot fail in some measure to obliterate the parochial idea which should never be lost sight of however hard it must be in some cases to realise it.

And here let me say with reference to our most populous parishes that what chiefly hinders the Church from fulfilling its obligations is the numerical weakness of its agents. What missionary work can one man or two men do among ten or fifteen or twenty thousand souls with all the labours of a pastorate pressing on his shoulders? We must remember that men, as a rule, are not Christianised in crowds. It is only by patient oft-repeated personal efforts that the practical heathenism which surrounds us can, humanly speaking, be overcome. Were it possible fully to equip every such parish with an adequate staff of clergy I do not doubt that much of the "lapsing" of which we hear so much might be prevented or cured, and perhaps some saving effected in the matter of stone and lime. But meanwhile to increase very largely the number of clergy seems hopeless. We have neither the men nor the means. There are indications, indeed, that in the near future it will become increasingly difficult. Though urgently required in many places, church extension must necessarily be a slow and gradual operation. Are we then to sit down in apathy with all the vast reserve of force

within the bosom of the Church left to run to waste? Might not the Church avail itself of *Lay Agency* to a much greater extent than it does? I am speaking now of paid and duly authorised Lay Agency. So long as the distinctive functions of the ordained ministers of the Word and Sacraments are safeguarded, I can see no objection to such a purpose. Our licentiates need have no fear that their place would be usurped. There is room for all. Of course the nature of the office would have to be defined and some training provided. But supposing the necessary precautions to be taken, I am persuaded that there are Godly laity, intelligent, fairly educated or perhaps highly educated and spiritually-minded men waiting to be employed who would render invaluable service to the cause of religion if only they received an *authoritative commission* thereto. If the lay agency with which we are familiar in these days is often defective in its methods and unsatisfactory in its results, the explanation is that to a large extent its work is carried on outside of the Church organisation, and without the authority which is required for its efficient discharge. A trained and educated ministry there must be, but there seems to be no good reason why it should not be supplemented by those on whom God has bestowed the necessary gifts. The eye cannot say to the head I have no need of thee, nor the head to the feet I have no need of you. The Church of England, where one might extend greater rigidity, has set us a noble example. In recent years the office of *Lay Reader* has been revived I understand with the best results. Hundreds of these agents are now working in every English Diocese. They are authorised to read the Holy Scripture in the church, to hold service and preach in the school-room or mission-room when desired to do so by the incumbent, to visit the aged, the sick, and others in the parish, and generally to aid the clergy in all duties in which the services of a duly ordained minister are not essential. Why the Church of

Scotland should be so slow to adopt a similar method on a much larger scale than at present and under proper regulations passes my comprehension. I have had experience of the value of such an agent in a large city parish, and I am certain that a well-considered movement in this direction would greatly help the Church to discharge its obligations in many of its parishes. "A living Church must have the power of self-adjustment or it ceases to live."

But what is needed most of all is a deeper sense of *personal responsibility* on the part of our Church members. The universal priesthood of believers is but feebly realised in our congregations, in other words, the calling of every Christian to be a fellow-worker with God in the things of His Kingdom. No church in Christendom recognises the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of the laity more fully than the Church of Scotland. At the same time it cannot be denied that lay activity is far from being developed as it might be and ought to be. Even in the most active congregations I do not suppose that five or say ten per cent. of the communicants can, strictly speaking, be called Church workers. I do not forget, God forbid, that there are Church workers in the best sense of the term whose names do not appear in the lists which represent the varied agencies of a Christian Church. The poor woman who is piously training up her children, and kindly and quietly ministering to her sick or suffering neighbour, is a Church worker though her name may not be recorded in any official register. But not less true is it that there are multitudes thronging our churches, and sitting at the Table of the Lord, who might easily engage in some form of Church work if sloth, selfishness, and indifference did not stop the way. Think, for instance, of the non-church-going population. If our Church members were what they ought to be, if they felt their own personal responsibility to the Church, if the inextinguishable flame of the love of Jesus was burning in their hearts, how much could be done on any Sunday afternoon or evening to

carry into the sad abode of vice and misery the blessed message of the Grace of God. I have known the experiment made. In a poor district of a city parish it was ascertained that there were 200 families estranged, as Dr Chalmers used to say, from the habits and decencies of the Christian life. In the congregation there were upwards of 2000 communicants. It was proposed that these 200 families should be allocated to 200 communicants, each member taking one family in charge, making it his parish so to speak, and trying by every means in his power to promote its physical, moral, and spiritual improvement. I am sorry to say that in that particular instance, though many came forward, the 200 missionaries were not forthcoming! And yet why should such a scheme be deemed utopian? If the Church is not fulfilling its obligations to its parishes surely the fault does not lie entirely at the door of ministers. We need more co-operation and zealous work on the part of our elders and of the laity of all sorts and conditions. In saying this I do not of course forget how many there are in all our parishes, men and women, who are rendering splendid service to our common Lord and Master. But it is true notwithstanding that the offices and ministries which the laity ought to be exercising are to a large extent unfulfilled. The majority in almost every congregation might be likened to that well-known lake in Palestine out of which not a stream or rivulet proceeds although the sacred Jordan is pouring its full flood into it from age to age. Such a "*Dead Sea*" is that congregation through which the river of life is ever flowing without there being any giving forth in love and sympathy and personal effort of that which has been received. It is the right and the duty of the laity to bear an individual part in the ministry of reaching those who are outside, and until that conviction is brought home to the hearts of our people, by the power of the Spirit of God, I see not for my part how the Church (which is not the Clergy in any exclusive sense) is ever to fulfil, as it ought to fulfil, its obligations to its parishes.

Rev. Prof. Menzies, D.D.—All our work in the Church, I think we are all agreed, is founded on the New Testament, which gives us both our authority and our inspiration. Of our Foreign Missions, we find the earliest type and example in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistles, specially those of St Paul. There we learn how the heathen were first converted to Christ, what Gospel was preached to them, what practices they had to give up, how far they were allowed to mould their own Church institutions, and how the heathen churches were related to the Mother Church, questions, all these, of vital importance in missionary theory and practice.

The earliest type and example of our Home Missions is to be found surely in the ministry of Jesus Himself to His own people. Him we all desire to follow, and in His mission to His people, and His attempt to gather them as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, there surely is much for us to learn as to our duty to Scotland. No doubt the circumstances are very different, and no doubt the example may be applied very indirectly and ineptly. But it may be possible to avoid such misapplication, and to find in Christ's teaching and ministry, as this Congress has already found, lessons for our own of an essential character and of enduring value.

Out of a multitude of points which might be named I shall mention four, somewhat different from those noticed yesterday, and standing in natural connection with each other.

1. The appeal Jesus made was national in its character. It was Jerusalem, His nation, that He sought to gather. He felt His nation to be in danger, forgetful of its true calling and its true way of peace, following blind guides, drifting heedlessly into war and destruction; and He sought to arrest that ruin. He called His people to remember, before it was too late, God's purpose for them, and to put themselves right with Him, so that they might be saved and not destroyed when the day of trial came. And when He called

this and that individual, He summoned him, not so much to save himself, as to help to save his people. The disciples were sent to all the cities of Israel, to rouse up the nation and get it ready for the great day. And this Home Mission was to prepare for the Gentile Mission. That was the way, then, as always. If the nation was right itself, others would be attracted to it and converted to its religion.

This national, patriotic element in the teaching of Jesus ought not to be forgotten. Least of all should a National Church forget it. This, it is true, is not the whole of Jesus' teaching. He teaches also, with incomparable force, the value of the individual soul, and the sacrifices the individual must make to keep his soul alive. But the individual, Christ teaches, is to forget himself for the sake of others and of public duty; for the kingdom of God, which was the national cause in its highest aspect, a man was to give up everything, and even part with life itself. Surely that teaching is not all outworn.

If we are to seek our brethren because we love them for their own sake, we are also to seek them because for the nation's sake as well as their own, they have a part to play in our national life, and we wish to see them play it well. Should we not appeal to our brethren as citizens, and urge them to realise with us the destiny for which God intends the Scottish people? Shall we not appeal to them with patriotic motives, and seek to kindle their enthusiasm for the national regeneration, that the light of this country also may shine afar. When we see anyone doing wrong, or any class leaving its proper duties neglected, shall we not represent to them that they are not taking the place they should in the life of their country? And shall we not also make the condition of the nation our study, and seek to understand what is wrong in our commonwealth, and where the needed amendments should begin. That the National Church should take a national view of its duty, implies many things in her attitude and policy; and for that view

there is good warrant, not in her position only, but in the Gospel.

2. We read a great deal about the publicans and sinners to whom Jesus felt Himself specially called. About these people Jesus took the national, the patriotic point of view. The flock was not complete when these sheep were wandering away from it. Zaccheus also was a son of Israel, though he had fallen out of communion with his people, and he ought to be recognised and put in his proper place again as a member of his nation. If we assimilate our Master's teaching here, we shall look at the lapsing of our fellow-citizens from ordinances, not only from the point of view of the Church, but also from that of the State. They are sons of our nation; why have they fallen away from their position as such? Why do they not take part in our sacrifices, nor share with us in the comfort and grace of our religious communion?

Is the Church to blame for this state of matters? Then should we not confess it? Is there any remedy we know of? Shall we not apply it that our people may be united again in heart and mind, and may fulfil its calling with new zeal?

3. The reason why these people had lapsed from ordinances was, in our Master's view, that religion had been made too difficult for them. The shopkeeper could not observe the laws of purity; the taxgatherer could not close his office on the Sabbath. And so they gave up external religion altogether. The yoke was too heavy for them. He offered them a lighter yoke. He offered a religion which had no formalities, and which everyone could practise. The publican praying to the Heavenly Father felt himself brought back into religious communion with his race, even though he could not keep all the holy days. The uncared-for multitude was brought to feel that God had visited His people and was near them.

Does not the Church owe this duty to her parishes, to encourage a religious teaching freed from all unnecessary

difficulties? I am sure we are agreed as to this. We must present our gospel in such a way that the educated and even those of scientific turn of mind shall be able to accept it. If we do not do that then our Church is not doing her duty to the country. We must present it in a form fit for a people nursed in freedom, not as a matter of authority, but as a matter of persuasion. We must seek to lead, not to drive, and we must qualify ourselves to lead. We must present our gospel in a way to show that we are not indifferent to the questions which now principally engage men's minds, that we also feel the stress of the great intellectual and social problems which to masses of our fellow-citizens possess such terrible reality.

I do not say that the individual minister, who is under certain legal restraints, is to cast these restraints aside; we are speaking here of the Church and her duty; and I do say that the Church owes to her parishes first of all the removal of all unnecessary restrictions on the preaching of the gospel. We must encourage such preaching as can both comfort those who are borne on the great stream of modern thought, and can be understood and welcomed by all classes of people.

4. I would say a word with regard to the frankness and outspokenness of the Master. He uttered His own thoughts, not the ideas of an institution; and He uttered them fearlessly. There is in His preaching a constant appeal to reason, a constant going back to first principles. Among the glorious virtues of the Saviour's character, it appears to me that those of entire reasonableness and truthfulness have been far too little recognised or insisted on by the Church. To many I know that no other splendour of His character endears Him more. Surely the Church discharges very inadequately her duty to her parishes if she does not encourage in her sons the virtue of intellectual truthfulness, of which Jesus Himself set so bright an example. If the Church would let it be known that she desired her ministers to teach their people the highest truth they can attain by

their studies, and to be not echoes merely but living voices in their parishes, it appears to me that she would attract to her service even more than she does now, the best of our students.

The Congress heard yesterday from many speakers that the great need of the Church is spirituality. I would put in a word for intellect. If intellect without spirituality is cold, and can light no fire, spirituality without intellect is blind and cannot see the road nor guide in it. To my mind the great need of the Church is intellectual power. If the Church can attract intellect to her service, she will not fail to guide and save the country even in a perplexing age like this. And intellect can only act effectually in an atmosphere of freedom. That given there is no fear that the things of the spirit will be neglected.

Speakers.

Rev. Dr J. Elder Cumming, Glasgow, said—Parish work in the spirit of Christ's life and teaching may be said to be the key-note of the last paper. Parish work in the spirit of Christ, as interpreted by St Paul, is the key-note of the few words I am permitted to say. "Followers of Me," he said, "even as I also am of Christ." That is to say, we must have the spirit of Paul's work after the pattern of Christ. Now, what ought we to be to our parishes in our work as ministers there? Shall I mention one or two of those great obligations to our parishes that lie upon us all? First, we owe to them to be spiritual men. Saul of Tarsus began by being a strong, a brave, an honest, a proud, a self-respecting man—one of the most promising, most severe—against whom no man could lift a finger. Was that enough—intellect and strength—to do the work of Christ? No. He had to pass, and did pass, through the great spiritual change, and after it came weakness, humbleness, brokenness of heart, self-condemnation, self-emptying. That was the first mark of Paul's work; that

is what we owe every parish in the Church. The next point is that the work of Paul was that of one who was a stranger wherever he set his foot—a stranger and pilgrim—a man at home only with God, his heart never resting here. "Not of the world, even as I am not of the world"—against the stream, always, everywhere. That was the spirit of Paul's work, and that is what we owe to our parishes. The next thing on which I lay my finger in Paul's labours was the wondrous love that possessed him in them all—the love that pleads, the love that labours, the love that waits, the love that suffers, love to Christ, not after the flesh—love to souls. Forgive me for emphasising that last requirement—love to souls—for it is the special Christian grace that no man but a Christian can have; it is a grace that all Christians, alas! do not seem to possess. It is the lacking grace in many a man's work, in many a man's life, for it is possible men and women should have their deepest attachments at home, and yet love everything there but the undying souls that are so dear to Him. Let us not before God endeavour to get rid of this awful obligation. There is not the soul of man, woman, or child in all our parishes that we are not bound to love as Christ loved us, as Paul loved his people, as God is loving you. Again, Paul was a man who was filled with the Holy Ghost in his work. Is that a matter of history only? Is such a thing to die out of the Church of Scotland? God forbid. Whether we stand in the pulpit, or at a sick-bed, or speak to a soul about peace, we owe it to our parishes to be filled with the Holy Ghost. One word more. All this eventuates in a life of sacrifice—not a life of luxury, not a life of ease and comfort, not a life of selfishness—but a life where one can say, "Not I, but Christ." "I labour," says Paul, "yet not I." "I live," says Paul, "yet not I; Christ liveth in me." To our parishes, to the people of the Church, and to the people of the land, we owe this above all—to live for Christ; if need be, to suffer and die for Him—and likewise for

them. Everyone on this platform knows that our attitude in regard to these things is that of brokenness of heart, deep humiliation before God, and self-condemnation; but we must never lower the standard of our duty because we have been so unable to realise our ideal. To be followers of the apostle as he was a follower of Christ —that in one word is what we owe to our parishes.

Rev. Professor COWAN, Aberdeen, said: The subject before us is very wide; I confine myself to four points:—

1. The duty of the Church to come, through her Supreme Court, more closely and systematically, and thus more effectively, into touch with all her parishes, in particular with those which are remote from the main centres of population, or which, even if near, are overshadowed by parishes more prominent. Apart from the services of the minister, who is himself one of the parishioners, the Church, as an institution, speaks to her congregations almost entirely through the cold medium of printed appeals and occasional pastorals which in themselves are excellent, but are most read by those who need them least, and least read by those who require them most. The result is that a large proportion even of our earnest people have no deep sense of their responsibility as members of the Church of Scotland and of the universal Church of Christ. What we need in this regard is a stated and fairly frequent visitation of all her parishes by the Church, not through paper and print alone, but through living men bearing personally a message from her. We began recently to do something in this direction through our Commission on the religious condition of the people, and also, in a limited sphere, through our Committee on Christian liberality. We need a permanent Commission to let each parish know from time to time that the Church is caring for *it* and expects it to care for *her*.

2. The duty of the Church to see that the religious provision for each of her parishes is adequate. The Church acts in this matter rather much on the principle (which is

very good in its own sphere) of helping those who help themselves. When a parish, through overgrowth of population, needs a fresh missionary, an additional place of worship, or a new parish to be created out of it, then, if it takes the initiative and raises so much money, the Church comes liberally with grants to its aid. But what of parishes which through poverty cannot, or through apathy will not, help themselves? Practically, they are let alone, and thus spiritual need is allowed to grow, until the destitute cease to feel their destitution, and those who have no church cease to wish one. Here again our recent Religious Commission made an effective commencement, and was the means, in numerous cases, of both fresh men and new buildings being added to the Church's organisation. What we need, in this regard, is a more permanent and effective agency to secure, through Presbyteries but at the instance, when necessary, of the Church's Supreme Court, that in every parish where the need exists, spiritual destitution and lapsing shall be dealt with promptly, and not be allowed to develop until they become trebly difficult to cure.

3. The duty of the Church to bring home to every one of her parishes its missionary responsibility to the world, through sending to each periodically a Foreign, Jewish, or Colonial missionary, or at least some man who has visited one or more of the Church's mission fields. In this department let us thankfully acknowledge a great advance in recent as compared with former times. For the first twenty-four years of my life I never saw, much less heard, a missionary. Now, our missionaries on furlough are sent forth, after a few months' rest, and rejoice to be sent forth to interest congregations in the work in which they have been engaged abroad. So far well; yet there remain probably hundreds of parishes and tens of thousands of members who are no better off in this regard than I and others were thirty years ago. Why? Through want of thorough organisation, some parishes have a large

share of the visits of missionaries, while others have no share at all. What we seem to need here is a Joint-Committee which shall include the Conveners of the Colonies, Jewish, and Foreign Missions—a Committee for allocating systematically the visits of our missionaries on furlough, so that not one parish, however humble or remote, shall miss the privilege, once in three years if practicable, of seeing and hearing a man who can commend the mission cause not at second hand but from personal knowledge and experience. Until that is done we may have large and increasing collections from the upper hundred of our congregations, but we shall not infuse a warm missionary sympathy into our people as a whole.

4. It is the Church's duty to do all in her power to provide for her parishes the most effective pastors. Here two questions face us—first, are we getting for our ministry all that we require, or all that we are entitled to obtain, of the best available material? and, second, are we making the most of the material which we get? The latter question was incidentally dealt with yesterday; and without endorsing some extreme statements then made, I desire to express cordial concurrence with the view that the Church ought to do much more than she does for the training of her Divinity students, especially in the practical and spiritual spheres. I believe that I can honestly say, on behalf of my colleagues in the Divinity Halls, that we are far from neglecting these departments of training: under a defective system we try to do what we can. But we need help from the Church much beyond what is given through a yearly course of six lectures on Pastoral Theology, admirable in every case as these lectures have been. We need, moreover, for ourselves the Church's commission, so that we and our students may feel that we are not merely teachers of the University, but ambassadors of the Church, whose vocation is to provide not only a learned but a truly effective ministry.

To the other question, whether we are getting for the

ministry all our due share of the best available material, we must answer No. We are getting some share of it,[1] but not the amount which we ought and need to obtain. Why not? For one thing, the Church is allowing the clerical profession to sink relatively in the social scale through the inadequate stipends provided for a large proportion of her ministers; and we who profess to repudiate the corruptions of Rome are practically endorsing one of her most dangerous errors, the compulsory celibacy of the clergy. Again, we lose, I believe, some of our best available material through an apparently too stringent insistence on doctrinal conformity. This over-stringency is more in appearance than in reality. The Church has long declared in deed, and the time has come for her to declare boldly in word, that signature to the Confession of Faith does not mean the rigid acceptance of every clause, but rather loyal adherence to those cardinal and fundamental doctrines of the Faith and of the Confession, of which it must be said that unless a man hold them firmly and warmly, the ministry is better without him.

A third cause of deficiency is our lamentable divisions, through which we demand for our population of little more than four millions a much larger number of clergy (nearly 5000) than are really required. Ecclesiastical union would mean a diminution of the quantity demanded and a corresponding superiority of the quality supplied There is one more removable cause of our not obtaining for our parishes the most effective pastors available. Like others of my professorial class, I am exposed to the temptation of what Bacon calls "idolatry of the den." But notwithstanding, I feel strongly that our Church makes a great mistake—a mistake not made by the sister Church of England—in barring the door of her ministry against men of ability,

[1] In a letter to the *Scotsman* and *Glasgow Herald*, published on the 30th October, Professor Cowan quoted statistics connected with the Aberdeen Divinity Hall, showing that about three-quarters of its students were graduates, and that of these nearly one-third graduated with honours either in Arts or in Divinity.

education, and earnestness, who at the age of from twenty-five to thirty come under the power of Divine grace, and might otherwise enter and strengthen our ministry, but who cannot at that age face a seven years' University course. I have met not a few such men, whose spiritual experience, and knowledge of the world and of human nature more than compensated for the lack of a complete University education, and who after a comparatively short theological training would prove excellent pastors. I am far from undervaluing a ministry of learning; but there is something still more valuable and vital—a ministry of POWER.

Discussion.

Rev. Dr HUNTER, Galashiels, said he had admired the great boldness with which Dr Cowan had tackled some rather delicate points. He wished to say something about the endeavour to exercise presbyterial superintendence in the way of presbyterial visitation. In the Presbytery to which he belonged, when the Assembly urged visitation of parishes, they thought it right to obey and began at once, and when in the following year the Assembly drew back from its decision the Presbytery thought, in fairness to the other parishes, they should continue to the end, and a month ago they completed their visitation of the presbytery. It was not always agreeable work, and quite unexpectedly, at least to him, it involved a very large amount of labour; but he thought also he was bound to say that at the end of it a great amount of practical good had been accomplished. Even in a practical way—the personal examination on the spot of Church property—they certainly managed to accomplish a great deal. Although reports are given in from time to time in response to schedules, it is a totally different thing when men are on the spot and can look for themselves. Out of the visitation of this presbytery there had come the renovation of two churches, rebuilding of two manses, and the addition of furnishings in two or three

churches. They found that the mention of needs by the presbytery to the congregation at once elicited gifts from the congregation which the minister had not before asked. In regard to other matters, they found in certain parishes where young ministers were recently settled, that there was often great anxiety on their part to consult the presbytery —perhaps small points to mention in a presbytery meeting, but not too small to mention in friendly conversation— and the very practical discussions that arose on some occasions were profitable to the young ministers, and not unprofitable even to the elder ministers. They had tried to break down the idea that the only duty of a presbytery was to depose a drunken minister—that seemed to be the idea in many places. The fact that a presbytery appeared in a parish remote from the presbytery seat, formed a link between the parish and the presbytery and the Church. In that light, presbyterial visitation was worth all the trouble, and he commended it to the careful consideration of some who, perhaps, had formed a prejudice against it.

Rev. A. MILLER, Bluevale, Glasgow, said there was one point that ought to be kept in view by the Church. Some of their parishes were accused of being a little congregational. He was himself thoroughly in sympathy with the great idea that the Church was a unit, and that all its parts must be thoroughly knit together, but when charges like that were made, did they ever realise who was to blame for it? Was it the Church or the parish? Remember what the parochial system originally was. When the parochial system was founded each parish was a social unit. They had a totally different state of things now. They were adopting machinery which was meant for one state of things to a condition of society totally different. In the industrial part of a large city they were giving effect rightly enough to the territorial system, which was the best guarantee that the work was done, but a poor parish ought never to be allowed to go on its own way and work out its own destiny, whatever it was. The city was

here the social unit. They could not expect the parish to be loyal to the Church unless the Church was loyal to it. If they wished their ministers to be loyal to the Church, they must give them an institution to which it was a pride and an honour to be loyal. In the east end of our great cities, among the great industrial populations, was where the problem of Christianity was to be wrought out, and there was something radically wrong with the Church if they did not have a competition with the young men as to who would occupy positions in those parts of their cities. They were simply creating two bodies of clergy—one to minister to the rich, and the other, a band of missionaries, to the poor. They must revolutionise their whole policy in this respect before they could get men of self-sacrifice and self-devotion.

Rev. ROBERT THOMSON, Glasgow, said he had listened to the remarks that had been made so far as these referred to what was called a proposal which had been in the air for some years to alter or change the doctrine of the Church of Scotland. That was promoted under the fallacious reasoning that the Confession of Faith contained doctrines too hard to be understood, and that the men of the coming generation were too soft in the head to understand it. That was an insult to the rising generation, whom he believed to be superior even to those of more advanced years.

Rev. Dr DONALD MACLEOD said that if they had had nothing but the papers and speeches of that day, they would be amply justified in holding the Congress. Something had been said about the admission of men to the ministry. The Church would soon have to face this question. There was a growing lack of licentiates for the work of the Church, and they would need by and by to consider how they would train laymen—or evangelists—men who should receive an actual position in the Church and do work of a kind that they would do as well as anyone having a better training. They had to face that as a coming necessity, and he hoped the Church would by and

by look into the question of training men who might be adapted for such work, and give them the necessary status.

Mr MICHAELIS, missionary to the Jews in Glasgow, spoke of the importance of missionaries having opportunities of addressing congregations so as to increase the interest of the Church in missionary work.

THE CHURCH: ITS OBLIGATION TO THE YOUNG.

PAPERS.

(1) *Religious Education of the Young in England and on the Continent.*

REV. J. H. CRAWFORD, M.A.—The general means of the education of the young in the Christian faith are the home, the school on week-days and Sundays, and the pastoral instruction of the clergy; but these means are used in different ways, and it is worth while to know something about their various workings.

It is well known that both in mediæval[1] and modern times the school has been the child of the Church and indeed all the elaborate machinery of our modern education sprang from the daily religious catechizing by some Church official of the children whom the minister more fully taught on Sundays. Accordingly the school system of Europe has still largely a religious character, secular education being the exception. The Holy Synod of Russia regards as the main object of the popular schools, the strengthening the faith of the people; the Prussian Law of 1854 (now modi-

[1] Mr Mark Pattison in his *Education Report*, 1859, says the Volkschule was strictly a Protestant institution born of the spirit of the sixteenth century. This is not quite true for Germany, though education before the Reformation had mainly a monastic character, and still less for Scotland. See Principal Lee's *Inaugural Address*, 1846.

fied) says much the same thing; and we have the opinion of Fröbel, the great educationist, that the school should first of all teach the religion of Christ.[1] Probably at no time was this function of the day school more important than now; if we accept the statement of Professor Rein of Jena that, in the unrest of modern times, the family is losing its strength and influence, and is being replaced by the school as a moral and religious educator.[2]

France is really the only country in Europe where education is generally secular, and Paris the only city where the name of God is excluded from the school books; but other countries which model themselves on France, such as Italy, Mexico (to cross the Atlantic), and some parts of Switzerland,[3] have a non-religious system. I cannot think that the teaching of morals and civics, which seems to me to be well done, is anything but a paltry substitute. Nor are the people of these countries at all satisfied. A very large proportion of education is put under clerical direction, like the schools of the Christian Brothers and the Jesuits. Still more is this the case with the education of girls, who generally go to schools taught by nuns. The law of 1882 (Camille Sée) which established secondary secular schools for girls—there are about fifty of these *lycées* or *collèges de filles*—has done little to alter the habit of the middle and upper class girls going to convents for their schooling; and hence we have the very remarkable divergence between the training of the boys, which is wholly secular, and of the girls, which is chiefly religious. In the United States, it is true that education is mainly secular; but there is always a religious tone in the school-work, and a distinguished French critic, M. Compayré,[4] was struck with the complete absence of what is called in France the lay (or anti-clerical) spirit. A confirmation of his view may be found in the fact that the United States

[1] *The Education of Man*, Fr. Fröbel. [2] See *Deutsche Revue* for Sept. 1895.
[3] Neuchâtel and Geneva, *e.g.*
[4] In a report to the French Minister of Public Instruction, 1893.

Education Department receives a report on *Sunday* schools, as well as day schools and universities.

And even in France there are compensations. It is almost impossible for an earnest educationist to be wholly secular; and Mr Matthew Arnold, who expresses a contempt for the moral instruction in French primary schools, which my own observation does not justify, had nothing but praise to give to the religious training given in the higher Normal School at Fontenay-aux-Roses. The same is true of Swiss training colleges, which train teachers for a system largely secular. The large share voluntary schools take in education both in England and France is a very important factor in the religious condition of the people. In England about two millions of children are educated in Board schools as against two millions and a half (2,500,000) in Church schools; while in France the figures are 3,900,000 for State schools, and 1,600,000 for Church schools. The proportion in France of children educated at the secondary schools is more favourable to the Church, and in the Church schools attendance has risen from 75,000 to 85,000 in the last few years, while the public lycées have declined. The figures are as follows:—Public lycées educate 47 per cent. of the whole number of children in secondary schools; Church schools, including the lesser seminaries, almost exactly the same proportion, while private schools, which are largely Protestant, educate between 6 and 7 per cent. In Scotland there are few voluntary schools, but these are chiefly with a view to special religious teaching; and of secondary voluntary schools the number is small, though excellent boarding-schools both of boys and girls are among the number.

But no wise man can approve a secular system of education. Its fruits are already seen in France in the increase of juvenile crime and alcoholism.[1] The opinion of M. Levasseur of the Institute is largely shared by thoughtful minds in France. He says "to abstain from speaking to

[1] See M. Berenger and others in *Revue Bleue* for 1895 (August, &c.).

children of God, of worship and of duty, under pretext of not wishing to interfere with their liberty of conscience is not to be truly impartial, because such restraint will allow the tendency to indifference to implant itself in the soul."

As for the other nations on the Continent there are two main methods of giving religious instruction in day schools. The *first* identifies the school with the Church, and is found in Spain, Russia, and Greece, in connection with the older communions, and with the Reformed Churches in Würtemberg, Bavaria, Scandinavia and Denmark. The *second* method is that of our own country where the schools are not under Church control, but where religious instruction is given either by the teacher or minister during school hours, and is adopted by Prussia, Switzerland, Holland, Austria, and other countries. In Belgium the chiefs of each religious denomination have to inspect and report on the religious teaching given, which is also done in some of the German States; while in Austria there is a local option in religious teaching as in Scotland.

In schools in different countries which I have visited, I have found the religious instruction well done; but it cannot be denied that there is throughout Europe, a considerable vigour in the anti-clerical spirit. It is, indeed, in many ways declining, as the statistics of French schools show, where there is an increase of clerical schools at the expense of diminishing secular schools, but I fear it is still strong even in our own country. The liberal doctrinaires to whom we owe our modern defective system of Scottish schools were strongly lay in feeling; and it is a striking circumstance to find no mention of religion at all in the report of the last Royal Commission on Secondary Education in 1894. In other countries this non-religious tendency arises from the opposition to the Roman Church, and the spread of a sceptical philosophy; in our own it comes from the difficulties due to sectarian divisions, which I think are surely much exaggerated. We must not too readily yield to the statements of such difficulties, which often have little real fact

behind them. Among the working men of Germany there is a good deal of objection to the religious education given in common schools. It is clear, full, and distinctly doctrinal, so much so that the historian Mommsen thought it should be simplified, but the educational authorities have no intention of altering their plans in obedience to the ignorant clamour of infidel socialists. Is it not a pity then that we yield so much as we do to the alleged sectarian difficulty?

I have spoken of secondary schools, and I doubt if any thoughtful man could say he was content with the religious teaching of many of our secondary schools. It is reduced to a very flabby minimum, and seems always close to the vanishing point. It contrasts very unfavourably with the course of the German gymnasia. This is due partly to the schools being in many instances too large,[1] to the secular character of our universities, and to our low educational ideals. Scotland never has produced a great teacher like Arnold, nor have any of her great thinkers given much attention to education; nor have we any good body of public opinion such as moves round the public school education of England. It is said that Carlyle wished once to be head of our Church Training College, but we appointed Mr David Stow.

Contrast the religious atmosphere of an English public school with its daily prayers and Sunday teaching suited to the boys, with the secularism of our Scottish high schools! And the same thing is true about our schools for girls which seem to me far inferior from a religious point of view, both to German schools and to English, which, thanks largely to Miss Yonge and the "Monthly Packet," are real centres of religious life.

Even in England they wish to render clearer and stronger the religious element, and apart from such special foundations as the Woodard schools, where this is the avowed

[1] Dr Arnold thought 400 the maximum number for a school, while Mr Thring put it at 300.

object, we have the general body of public schoolmasters acquiescing in proposals by one of their number, Mr Tancock of Tonbridge, to render more definite the relation of school teaching to Church membership.

The secret, manifestly, of good religious teaching is to have well-trained teachers, and this the denominational colleges provide for elementary schools; but where in the non-religious modern university of Scotland is there any guarantee for our secondary teachers being filled with religious knowledge or a religious spirit? The tendency is all the other way; and this is intensified by the recent arrangements for training teachers in connection with the universities. We can only hope for good men: we take little pains to secure them.

But not only are good *teachers* needed, we need a good *scheme* of teaching which should be uniformly adopted and suited to elementary and secondary schools. I know there is such a scheme drawn up by the School Board Religious Inspection Society, but it does not seem the work of a man who had given much attention to the subject, or had a clear principle to guide him in drawing it up. The German schemes are the best I know; and if you remember the large time given to religious teaching in Germany, you will readily see what a powerful instrument is placed in the hands of religion. Dr Falk, the German Minister of Education, prescribed four hours weekly as the time allotted for religious teaching, and this is generally found in Prussia, though as Von Gossler, his successor, extended the time to six hours if desired, a longer time is sometimes given. In Bavaria, Austria, and Switzerland, the time is less; while in Würtemberg it is extended in the higher classes to seven hours. The Würtemberg teachers think it too much, and have often petitioned to lessen the amount, but in vain.

But not only is the amount of time large, but there is a clear idea as to the *purpose* of the teaching. Take the words of the Prussian Regulativen: "The school receives

the children in order to prepare them for the conscious reception of all the gifts of grace which the scheme of salvation contains, of which gifts they are prospective heirs." The governing principle of these regulations (which were secured by the influence of men like Hengstenberg prevailing over deistical educationists like Diesterweg), is that all school teaching must be a direct preparation for the fuller dogmatic instruction of the Church authorities, and this applies as well to Sunday schools in the form in which we have them. In Germany this is aided in every possible way by the use of the Liturgy, the decoration of day schools at the solemn feasts of New Year's Day, Easter, Pentecost, the Reformation, and All-Souls, but also by children's services (Kindergottesdienst) in the schoolroom, children's prayer-hours (Erbauungskunde), and other devotional aids. I may illustrate this also from the case of Rome, where, of course, the schools are mainly under priestly direction. In Rome the daily instruction is supplemented by enrolling the children, while yet unconfirmed, in sodalities (or guilds) where the members under a director encourage each other to the due remembrance of their religious duties.

What is the aim of our day and Sunday school teaching? It must be to prepare the child who is already a member of the Church for a complete incorporation into the Church by a true and living faith. We don't want to make the children biblical critics or antiquaries, as I sometimes think the object of Sunday school lessons seems to be. This definite aim of full Church communion *should* regulate all our work, and I may say that in English Church day schools, and in Protestant day schools throughout Europe (not to speak of Sunday schools), this aim is steadily worked towards. The same, of course, is true of Roman Catholic and Greek Church teaching.

It is remarkable how a vigorous revival of religious life —when it is really genuine, and not the modern hysterical counterfeit—at once gives a forward impulse to the religious

teaching of the young. Luther may be said to be the creator of the modern catechetics, and he was anticipated by the Waldenses, Bohemians, and other earlier reformers; and what a number of catechisms did the Reformation produce all over Europe! The religious revival under the Jesuits, and later in North Italy under Borromeo took mainly an educational form. Coming later down we have the Covenanting times in Scotland, the Pietist awakening under Spener in Germany, the Oxford movement in England, and our own Evangelicalism of seventy years ago, all with a large crop of catechisms. Even cold rationalism had its enthusiasm for the young, and its catechism (such as Dinter's) of natural religion. Then, who is not familiar with the Catechism of St Sulpice, originating with Olier about 1650, and the organising, some years later, of the Brothers of Christian Schools (1684), as marking the revival in the Gallican Church: and I do not think I am wrong in pointing to the much greater interest taken in our own Sunday schools as one of the marks of a real awakening to fresh vigour in our own Church.

Another influence which moulds instruction is naturally the theories of educational philosophy which are current for the time being. This is markedly seen in Germany. In the time of Luther, and for a century or two after, the teaching consisted, as it does in Mohammedan theological schools, almost entirely of mechanical committing to memory. The teacher did not try to explain anything. This system was superseded by the Pestalozzian method, which made it a principle that the child was to learn nothing it did not understand. Luther's Catechism, of course, had to be laid aside for some colourless thing like Dinter's. All this was parallel to that undenominational theory of neutral religion, favoured by such men as Laveleye and Diesterweg, some fifty years ago, which is still the ruling idea in Holland, and apparently still believed in by some people in our country. Philosophers like Cousin and theologians like Julius Müller saw little

good in such a system, and with the fall of Pestalozzianism, which is so complete that kindergarten is being banished from German schools, the neutral religion theory also fell. German education is now in the hands of the Philistines and is becoming a great system of *cram*, and only now and then does a theorist, like Dittes, arise to bewail the past, or like Ziller and Rein to construct a Utopia on Herbartian lines. Religious education has accordingly suffered a good deal, but it has good roots in the clear teaching of fact and the learning of the Catechism and hymns.[1] The main feature of the newer educational theories is, however, specially valuable to us. The leading principle of education according to Herbart and his followers, is unification and concentration. We don't want the disconnected fragments of knowledge which the Sunday and day schools have been giving our children, but we want a direct aim at a true Christian life in the fellowship of the Church. It is not so much to give facts to the mind and memory as to unfold the disposition (to speak in Herbartian language), to save the soul in the fullest sense. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the whole course of religious instruction in the Sunday school should be under the direct supervision of the minister himself, who should keep clearly in view his purpose of building up the children in the faith. It would be better, perhaps, had all clergymen to take a course of pædagogy as they have to do in Germany; but it is the earnest spirit and clear purpose that are chiefly necessary. Many think that in the method of St Sulpice, the clergyman has an instrument ready to his hand. But it must first be remembered that in the Roman Church, where in most cases the "Catechism" is the only Sunday school, the first communion is taken at twelve years of age, and few receive any further instruction, though a few attend "catechisms of perseverance"; while the average

[1] Matthew Arnold and Mark Pattison regarded the hymn-learning as most valuable.

Protestant in Europe is not confirmed till sixteen years of age, and in Scotland, later. Too late with us, is it not? And should we not so order our schools and teaching that confirmation should be the natural goal which they aim at and which in ordinary circumstances they reach? Should we not have some authorised *standard of knowledge*, at least, for confirmation, and a solemn public service approved by the Church? Some may bring in their views of conversion into this matter, but I ask them simply to look at the practical facts and needs of our time. The Catechism of St Sulpice is a method suited for simpler and more formal teaching than ours, and less individual treatment; following in this the whole genius of the Roman Church. Where I have seen it, it has appeared to me noisy and ineffective, recalling the Bell-Lancaster methods in education; and I have my doubts as to the results in the individual child. But it has the two great advantages of a *direct aim* and *simple treatment*, and perhaps, I may add, of ministerial guidance. We need more *simplicity* in our Sunday school work, less historical and geographical commenting and more real religion; and we certainly need to keep in view more than we have done the great aim of bringing the child step by step to an intelligent and pious first communion and subsequent active Church life. The importance of the minister himself doing everything he can in the education of the young is, I think, admitted by all; and while I don't undervalue our Sunday school teachers, it is clear that unity of aim can only be won by the personal direction of the minister himself. I am of opinion that till the clergy of our Church enter with energy and enthusiasm into the training of the young, our Sunday schools and day school instruction will continue to occupy their present position, which must be put very far down in the list of the Christian education of Europe.

Probably a scheme of organically developed instruction

like Ziller's is the best we can have; but after all, what is needed is a deep conviction, such as Luther had, that the life and hope of the Church have their earthly roots in the godly nurture of the young. Under all systems a direct purpose and an earnest piety will always win the best results.

(2) *The Use of the Old Testament in the Religious Teaching of the Young.*

Rev. Prof. Robertson, D.D.—The regard paid to the Old Testament in the Christian Church, and the practical use of it for instruction and guidance, have varied much in different lands and in different periods.

In our own country it is perhaps safe to say that it has been more read and more highly prized than in many. But even among us it may be questioned whether it holds so high a place as it once did. About half a century ago when school books were few, and when the teaching profession was not well organised, it was, along with the New Testament, a regular reading book; and I can well remember when the expression "out of the Testament and into the Bible"—for so the Old Testament was called—was the equivalent of the modern passing from one standard to another. At a somewhat earlier period, the "Proverbs" was a book not only read but committed to memory, as were also the metrical psalms.

And when we go back to the period of the Covenanters and the still earlier period of the Reformation, it is well known that the men who did and suffered so much in those times were not a little indebted for their endurance and their daring to the inspiration of the Old Testament. It is a significant fact that in the controversy about the Divine Right of Kings, the democratic party generally relied upon appeals to the Old Testament, while their opponents fortified their contention mostly by "texts" from the New.

This high regard of the Old Testament Scriptures had two influences, both observable in Scotland. In the *first place*, it produced a general acquaintance of the people with the contents of the books. Its Proverbs became household words, with which many a pious parent admonished or encouraged the young. Its heroes and worthies were set up for reproof and instruction. Its phrases and hymnology worked themselves into the devotional language of the Church and the family. Its sacrificial and ritual systems were handled as sacred symbols of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, and, in general, the phraseology of the Old Testament was much employed for the expression of Christian ideas.

In the *second place*, the constant use of the Old Testament contributed to the formation of national character. No doubt there are many factors in that complicated process, and probably too high an estimate has been formed of the amount of influence exerted by such a book as the Proverbs on the shrewdness of Scotch character and the sententiousness of Scotch wisdom. But it is hardly possible to overrate the influence of the Old Testament on the type and tone of the national religion and theology. Especially in an age when historical criticism was not yet, and when a "text" from any part of the Bible was sufficient proof of any doctrinal position, or support for rule of conduct, or basis of religious sentiment, it readily came about that a certain toughness of fibre, and sternness of tone, and ruggedness of form, were imparted to the religious character, which for the times had their good aspect, though to us now they seem somewhat harsh and repellent. Then as to theology, what a strong hold did the idea of the *Covenants* retain upon the mind, and how much has it moulded our traditional conceptions. Theologians were not content with merely accepting, but they carried out even more fully the interpretations of the Old Testament found in the Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

I would not like to say how far the so-called "evangelical

movement" in Scotland modified the regard in which the Old Testament was held. In the nature of the case it was likely to have a double influence; stimulating, on the one hand, the desire to find the distinctive doctrines of the New Testament in the texts of the Old; and, on the other hand, tending to a respectful disregard and decent ignoring of passages and texts which savoured of legalism, work-righteousness, and so forth. We can recall how preachers like M'Cheyne, in their loftiest flights, clothed their thoughts in the phraseology of the Song of Songs; and, on the other hand, you may still find people who tell you they like a good gospel sermon, speaking in the same breath with suspicion of a minister who "takes his text from the Bible," *i.e.* the Old Testament.

Since school-books have been multiplied, and School Boards have come in, it is quite probable that the Old Testament receives less attention in the day-school than it did in former days. And I fear that even the instruction given in the Sunday schools succeeds only to a partial extent in making up the deficiency. Judging by certain facts that are within my own knowledge, I should say that the average youth of the present day has anything but a thorough acquaintance with his English Bible. I am in close contact with divinity students, who are soon to become ministers of the Word, and are impatient for the time when they shall occupy the pulpit; and this fact has struck me forcibly. When a familiar chapter, as one would regard it, is placed before an average class to be translated at sight, and when one would expect that after a fair start the memory would supply what was lacking in Hebrew grammar and vocabulary, the result has often greatly surprised me and given me food for reflection. The differences in the early training of different individuals are so marked as to lead one to conclude that no uniform sustained system of Bible education exists. There was a time when ordinary men and women could charm away the heaviness of sleepless nights by repeating for hours the psalms of David; and

bed-ridden sufferers were content to have for years on their pillow beside them the Bible and the Catechism; but I fear that generation is fast passing away.

I have been tacitly assuming that the Old Testament is worthy of special regard, and that any neglect of its use is to be deplored. But perhaps some one may say that it is a good sign if the Jewish Scriptures are allowed quietly to fall into the background, and that the rising generation will be all the better Christians if they are moulded as little as possible on the type of the Covenanters, for example. I have even read somewhere in these last days that the lamentable state of things which has come about in the Transvaal is owing to the fact that the Boers are great readers of the Old Testament. As to that, I would recall what was said a little ago about the many factors that go to produce national character, and venture to add that it is not too much reading of the Old Testament that produces an unlovely character, but the reading only of the parts that are found congenial, and especially the omission to read and mark well the New Testament as well as the Old, mistakes, both of them, of old standing and deeply rooted.

But I do think it opportune to call the attention of a Congress like this to the educative value of the Old Testament.

And before speaking of its value for religious education, I would like to vindicate its claims to consideration as a part of the literary education of the young. They say that some medicinal agents would be more highly prized if they were less common, and perhaps just because the Bible is so accessible its literary value is overlooked. The habit we have acquired, also, of regarding it solely as a part of the Canon, has made us overlook the fact that it is a literature of endless variety, and never-failing charm, and elevating tendency. If professors of Greek and Latin are allowed to magnify their office by vaunting their studies as *literæ humaniores*, it may be permitted to a professor of

Hebrew to claim that title for a literature which has attracted the best thinkers of all ages, and has furnished models for the purest style of the most finished orators; while it was also the people's book in all lands and in all times, the guiding compass of the pioneers of the purest civilisation, the world's standard of appeal in the onward progress of freedom and righteousness. I feel very confident that a freer use of the contents of the Old Testament in this direction, untrammelled by what may be called an *over*-reverent reserve, would contribute to refine the literary taste and style of the rising generation, produce high ideals of life, and in general bring about that complex thing which we call culture, as powerfully, to say the least, as the reading of the Greek and Roman classics or the standard models of our own literature. It would, at all events, supplement these and infuse into them an element which would do the pupils much good.

As to the value of the Old Testament for religious education, I will not go into minute details, but draw attention to some great ideas and principles lying at the foundation of the Old Testament Scriptures, all of them of practical importance for the education of the young, and some of them peculiarly applicable to the situation of the Church in our own times.

(1) Every page of the Old Testament, we may say, is stamped with the name of God. Dr A. B. Davidson's words, often quoted, will bear repetition here: that the message of the Old Testament to the world is summed up in one word—the word God. Now this involves a view of the world and of human life that should not be left out of account, or merely taken for granted, in the education of the young. Are they to read day by day of the exploits of Greek gods, and not hear of the one God who rules over all? Are they to be told of the laws of nature and never be reminded of the Lawgiver and Lord of Nature? Are they, in the study of history, to be directed only to the contests of armies, and the strife of parties, with never a

glance upward to Him who holds the nations in the hollow of His hand? If the Old Testament were continually in their hands as a text-book, it would be impossible for them to overlook this aspect of nature, and history, and life. And therefore, with all their "gettings" of information, they should get this understanding.

(2) That "the righteous Lord loveth righteousness" is a truth uniformly insisted upon in the Old Testament is a feature of the Book so patent that he that runs may read it. By example and by warning it is enforced, in every branch of the literature it is implied, and though the history shows only too plainly how the truth was perverted or ignored by a people trusting that all would be well with them because Abraham was their father, and their national God would be faithful to His covenant, yet as oft as this vain trust manifested itself so often and unfailingly did some man of God rise up to shatter it, and to proclaim that only he that doeth righteousness is righteous. A very proper and very seasonable truth for old and young in these days: a truth that cannot be taught too early nor with too close an application to the concrete affairs of daily life—the wholesome old doctrine that those who believe in God should be careful to maintain good works. It is a time for us to cease railing at the ineffectiveness of work-righteousness, and to teach our children that it is not enough that they be baptised and hold the Christian faith, but that they should exhibit in all the relations of a complicated life, and amid the peculiar temptations of our modern civilisation, the old virtues of truth and righteousness with which alone God is well pleased.

(3) A third principle ever recurring in the Old Testament is, I think, of special value, and particularly so in our own day: the unquenchable hope that the good will ultimately prevail. It is quite pathetic to observe this hope eternally springing up in the heart of old Israel, strongest often at times when the prospect was the most gloomy. It is a principle that is "prophetic" in more senses than one.

And it is peculiarly refreshing to get out of the pessimistic atmosphere which infects even the young among us, and to have the soul braced for the ever recurring struggle of life by the encouraging words and confident anticipations of the old prophets. How many a battle has been won by their aid in the lonely closet, in the council hall, and on the tented field! This is an armour that the most youthful Christian may with safety buckle on as he goes forth to his life's battle; a light and bright armour suited to buoyant youth; the sooner he uses it the better, for he will have need of it in later years. And when he has worn it well his testimony will be added to that of those who have gone before him; for it has been well tried and proved.

Now, it may be said that all these are obvious truths, and taken for granted in our Christian profession; and, moreover, that they are taught in a higher way in the New Testament. It is just because they are so fundamental that there is danger of the foundations being buried too deep under ground for observation. And there is this in particular to be said as to the enforcement of them in the Old Testament books, that these books cover so wide a period of history, and are so varied in their reference, while the principles in question are so predominant and apparent in all of them, that the study of the books is calculated to bring home the truths with recurring and redoubled emphasis, and to suggest their practical application in every possible situation and circumstance of life.

I think we have at present substantial and palpable proof of the power of the Old Testament over the conscience, and therein of its value for religious culture. Not a few of those who call themselves agnostics, and feel themselves repelled by the doctrinal parts of the New Testament, frankly admit the ethical value and religious force of the Old. I have myself been told by one whose sincerity I had no reason to doubt, that he found more rest to his spirit and satisfaction to his doubts in the Psalms than in the New Testament Epistles or even the Gospels. Whatever

we may think of such a position, it is one whose possibility we are bound to recognise in these times. And perhaps there are more than we would suppose who are consciously or unconsciously drifting away from the distinctive doctrines of Christianity, and falling back on what they consider firmer ground, which is indeed nothing but the ground of the Old Testament doctrine of righteousness. I say "falling back"; for though we are accustomed to speak—in the domain of apologetics—of the New Testament as the citadel, of which the Old is but the outworks, yet there is a sense in which the Old Testament may be regarded as the more central. It contains the presuppositions on which the New Testament rests. And while it is not too much to say that a man is not necessarily or by any means to be pronounced irreligious who does not accept the New Testament, yet one who refuses to subscribe to the fundamental truths of the Old which I have mentioned cuts the very ground from religion, for these, in a more or less pronounced form, are found in any religion worthy of the name. While, therefore, we may deplore any such falling back as I have hinted at, for which, perhaps, some of the modern literature read unthinkingly by the young is partly responsible, we should allow the Old Testament to have its own educative work over such minds, and to prove, as it has often done before, a schoolmaster to lead to Christ.

(4) But I would now mention one feature of the teaching of the Old Testament which is even more prominent there than in the New, and which deserves particular regard in these days. The Old Testament gives special prominence to the *nation* and its religious standing. So strongly marked is this characteristic that some modern writers maintain that the individual was of no account, and regarded himself as of no account as a religious entity in old Israel, and that the ideas of personal responsibility and personal sin did not arise till the nation was just breaking up. However that may be, it is quite plain from every page that Israel as a whole was regarded as sustaining a relation of privilege and

responsibility before God. From the nature of the case this was not so prominent a feature in the New Testament, because the first Christians were few and isolated, and the Apostolic Church was in the midst of a great heathen world. But now whole countries own the religion of Christ, and the responsibility of Christian nations, the responsibility of the professing Christian Church as a whole, is pressing itself upon the attention of thinking people. This, indeed, is but another aspect of the problem of the Church and its relation to social questions. And here again the Old Testament has been prophetic. The constitution of old Israel, though it seemed unfavourable to personal religion, foreshadowed the ultimate triumph of religion, and we are come into the heritage of privilege, and of consequent responsibility, to which the glowing anticipations of the prophets pointed. The task before the Christian Church is to realise the ideal of the City of God, the redeemed Jerusalem, in which there shall be nothing unclean, but where the commonest thing shall be inscribed, "Holiness to the Lord."

Our young people cannot too soon be familiarized with this aspect of religion. It will prepare them for taking their part intelligently in the affairs of life as good Christian citizens; it will counteract the tendency to regard religion as solely a personal and individual matter; it will nourish patriotism in its best sense—and love of country, an eastern proverb says, is part of religion. One of the most hopeful signs of modern Church life is the increasing desire to bring it to bear upon the difficult problems and complex relations of daily life. It is this desire, if I understand the matter rightly, that led to the inception of the present Congress. The principle has never been denied, it has all along been acknowledged in our pulpit teaching—for it is the fundamental Christian principle: "Whether ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." The peculiarity of the new expression of the desire is the aim to bring it to the test in the concrete relations of class and class, of labour and recreation, and so forth.

And I cannot help feeling that some guide to the application of the principle may be found in the constitution of the Hebrew State, in which not only was the sanction of religion thrown over the whole collectively, but there was provided also that even the minutest details were subject to its control and hallowed by its influence. Men of science in our own day have paid their tribute of admiration to the sanitary arrangements and laws of food of the Jewish economy. Let it not be forgotten that such matters were part of a religious system; we are only beginning to learn the lesson that the care of our bodies is a plain religious duty, and attention to the health of the community a service of God.

I have confined myself to the most general aspects of a subject which has endless details. The object has been to put forward a plea for a more general use of the Old Testament in the day schools and Sunday schools, and I may add the higher schools of the country. For this volume contains materials for instruction in all "grades," simple stories for the children, history teaching by examples for the more advanced, wisdom for the thinkers; and all embodied in a style (albeit in translation) of purest English and powerful attractiveness. It is for others who are more in touch with the educational arrangements of the country to say how far this is already done, or in what directions there are openings for its wider exercise. It is remarkable that something like what has been done in the domain of classical and native literature has not been more freely attempted in what we call sacred literature. There are now to be seen in the hands of pupils in various grades separate prints of individual books or chapters of a classic author, a single play of a dramatist, or a single poem of a poet. And I do not know why there should not be separate prints, with brief necessary notes and introductions, of some of the books, or a series of chapters from the Old Testament. The Book of Proverbs was printed separately and used as a textbook in the old days. Why should not such a beautiful

little story as that of Ruth or the story of Joseph and many others be so treated? Why should not such text-books as we already have in the Cambridge Bible for schools be made text-books in our secondary schools? The books of Job and Ecclesiastes, *e.g.* are quite suited to modern times. There is surely something out of proportion when Bible instruction is crowded into the briefest space of the school curriculum, or praetermitted altogether in higher schools on the ground that other subjects leave no time for it. This is surely a sign of misconception of the whole purpose of education, which is not to cram as much into the youthful mind as it can be made to receive in the shortest time, but to bring the young under such influences as will mould character, and prepare them for bearing a worthy part in society. If anything is to be crowded out of our schools, let them be things which the scholar will by-and-bye pick up for himself, or things which experience has shown do not enter vitally into his system and produce character. We have been too prone to make a cleft between things sacred and things secular, and with a mistaken reverence have refrained from bringing God's name and divine things into close contact with ordinary occupations and so-called worldly matters. Once more let us take a lesson from the Old Testament, which not only tells us that the earth is the Lord's and its fulness, but does not disdain to exhibit Him as hallowing all life by His presence. And as the desire is quickened among us that His Kingdom may come and His will be done on earth, let us so direct the education of the race that is to follow us, that they may rise up a consecrated people to enter into the glorious inheritance of the sons of God.

Speakers.

Sir J. N. Cuthbertson.—There is no more bounden duty lying upon the Church of Christ than her obligation to the young, whether in her own interest, or in that of her baptised children, or in obedience to her Lord's command,

"Feed my lambs." I lately listened to a powerful address on this subject, the key-note of which was the "re-discovery of the child," meaning thereby that in these times much more attention is given than formerly to the religious instruction of the young, as well in church as in school. The child is naturally, almost instinctively, religious, that is to say, is peculiarly receptive of the religious idea in its simplest form, seems, in fact, incomplete without it—an irreligious child, what a horror! And what more natural than to rise from the idea of a loving earthly father to that of our Father in heaven? See then that this faculty be not neglected, else the weeds of ignorance and selfishness will soon grow apace and choke the good seed of the Word. Instruction in divine things should start with the very beginning of life, and cannot, under the mistaken plea of leaving to the young person freedom of judgment, be afterwards added as a new branch of knowledge. As the youth advances in life he needs the sustaining influence of religion at every step.

During the last half century much has been done for the godly upbringing of the young by Sabbath schools—at first received with suspicion as possibly interfering with parental control and pastoral responsibility, but now accepted as a necessary part of every church organisation. It would be difficult briefly to sum up the many benefits of Sabbath schools, but let us put it shortly in this way—what would Scotland have been to-day without its Sabbath schools? These should be kept in close connection with the minister and kirk-session, not that the minister or his assistant should always act as teacher or superintendent—better not, I think—but let the minister look to the training of the teachers, and in that way make sure of the soundness of what is taught.

There is perhaps nowadays a slackening of parental authority, not to be wondered at when so many of our people live in houses of one or two apartments, but by no means confined to any one class of society. Even among well-to-do people there is a carelessness in the religious instruction

of the family, which did not use to be, and to this is largely due the too frequent perversions to Ritualism and Romanism. It is scarcely to be conceived that any one well acquainted with the Bible and Shorter Catechism should thus fall away. And yet there are those who decry the Shorter Catechism. Well, I am free to say I was early taught the Catechism, and it still is the stay of my life and of my faith. I believe it is quite a mistake to suppose that children have any dislike to the Catechism, or any difficulty in learning it; my experience has been quite the reverse. And no substitute for it, no simpler manual of a satisfactory kind, has ever been produced.

As far as the public schools are concerned, I have reason to know that as a rule religious instruction is faithfully given, in terms of the Education Act and subject to the conscience clause. And with the greater freedom allowed to teachers under the new code, there is hope for even better things in future. In the General Assembly twenty years ago I ventured to say I could see no reason why the Bible should not be used in school as a reading book, and to that opinion I still adhere. Religion should always be taught in a loving and attractive manner, and should permeate all school life; an earnest teacher will find ways and means of presenting everything in a Christian spirit. The Church has no official authority in the public schools, but ministers and laymen alike can generally find a place at the School Board if they seek it. The members of the Church ought to take an interest in School Board work, and thereby make sure of the continuance of the "use and wont" of religious teaching. Beware of a purely secular system of education: wherever it has been tried it has proved most disappointing, nowhere more so than in Australia at the present day. And be it understood, in the schools of Scotland there is really no religious difficulty; the Roman Catholics have their own schools to their own liking, but they have no objections that the Protestant majority should teach their own faith and do it well. It is to be hoped the nation will never forget what

the Church did for the education of the people in the past.

Mr Colin G. Macrae, W.S., Chairman of Edinburgh School Board, said he hoped the day was far distant when a speaker addressing a Scottish audience would require to persuade them that the religious education of their children was a necessity. He did not argue that question or discuss it. He assumed it was a rooted principle in the minds of their people that their children should receive a religious education. But results which he knew they all deplored, and which they would resist if an attempt was made to impose them upon the country, might be accomplished by sheer neglect, by indifference, and by remissness. He did not say there was any danger of that at present, but its possibility was enough to make them alive to it. He pointed out four directions in which he would like to see religion taught to the children. In the first place, they desired that the children should receive an adequate knowledge of the historical facts of Scripture. In the second place, they should have a certain acquaintance with the general doctrines of the Christian faith. In the next place, he would like them to possess a knowledge of the principles of conduct which ought to guide Christian people. And lastly, they should have their minds stored with certain portions or texts of Scripture. These four objects could be attained in any day school. But there still remained the most important part of the child's instruction. The heart must be touched, the conscience quickened; the character must be moulded, and these things could not be done so well in the day school as by the Church. The real important point was that the Church should realise what was its special function.

Rev. John Smith, B.D.—Mr Crawford in his interesting and instructive paper, has indicated that our education if it is to be real and effective, must be an education of the heart as well as of the head. It is a mistake to imagine that an advance in art means an improvement

in spirit, that the completest acquaintance with science is a guarantee of goodness, that a thorough drilling in classics and mathematics will make noble men and women. Something more is wanted. When the great movement on behalf of education started twenty-five years ago, some of its pioneers believed that it would prove the death-blow to vice and crime. As one school was erected after another, it was said, "There goes the destruction of another prison." But they were quickly disillusioned. It was soon discovered that the possession of knowledge and cleverness only gave people an opportunity of indulging in vice of a more intellectual and elaborate kind. In France where the movement spread there were men who said, "Look at our prisons, the majority of those in gaol can neither read nor write, educate them, and vice will disappear." They did educate them and what was the result? The majority could read and write. The position was reversed. Crime had not been diminished. And why? To fill the mind with facts and figures was not to fill the moral nature. It proved what Aristotle said long ago, the multitude of facts is the rout of thought. And what men like Fourier argued was this, that if France is to hold her own in the race of nations she must reverse her method and supply what is lacking in her education, namely, the moral element. What is true of France is true of every other nation. What we want is the cultivation of the moral sense. The fear of God and the love of righteousness must lie at the root of all our education. The criticism passed on our modern system is largely true. We teach the scholar the grammar and the forms of speech but few of the things most worthy to be spoken. We teach him the seas, the lands, the rivers, the mountains of a dead or empty world; but of the histories that have passed there, the proud passages of his country's life, the good men who should be a beacon to his path, we leave him too much in ignorance. In other words, we bestow great pains on increased mental expansion and bestow little

in proportion on "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, and whatsoever things are of good report." It cannot be too deeply impressed upon us, that until we fill the heart with resisting power against lawless passion and make it strong against the temptation to subtle and deliberate vice, we are not dealing fairly with the rising generation. For as Ruskin has somewhere said, "The end of education must be to get into this British Island the greatest number of good and brave men and women. *They* are to be your money's worth." To accomplish this the Bible must be our chief means. It has had most to do in forming all that is best and noblest in our national character. None saw this more clearly or expressed it more eloquently than that master of literature, Matthew Arnold, or that master of science often described as an agnostic, Thomas H. Huxley. There is no fear of the Bible being pushed out of school. This age, despite all that is being said against it, is peculiarly sensitive to the value of religion upon life. It is strongly convinced that it ought to be made a potent factor in moulding the character of the young. The great founders of education in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Sturm and Comenius, were right in giving it a foremost place in their schemes. The truth is, the schoolmaster, like the statesman, cannot neglect it. It is as vital to the school as to the State. It is religion however not merely as a motive to virtue but as a revelation of the truth. The Christian Church is not only an institution for improving human morals, but it is also the bearer of God's message to the souls of men. To create a sense of duty, charity, and devotion, to rouse and quicken enthusiasm for the divine Exemplar of moral and spiritual perfection must be the aim of religious instruction in public schools. But to obtain this we must have the help and co-operation of the parent. It is satisfactory to know that few take advantage of the conscience clause. In quarters

where you least expect it you find the demand for Bible knowledge. I knew of one who declared himself an agnostic, when asked if he objected to his child receiving religious instruction, replied in a tone of surprise, "Why, my boy is taught the history of Rome and of Greece, and why should he not be taught the history of Israel and of Christianity." We also want the earnest teacher, and in many schools we have him. I took the trouble to find out the opinions of the headmasters in our schools with secondary departments, regarding religious instruction in the higher classes. Here is what one of them says: "The more I think of it the more I am convinced of the desirability of increased Scripture teaching in the secondary departments of our schools. Instead of our present half-hour lesson, we could quite well give two lessons of half an hour each per week, and with advanced classes this time would admit of a good deal of ground being covered in the year." As a Board we are likely to act on that. For Class VII. our scheme is the Gospel of St Luke. For Class VIII. the Acts of the Apostles. For Classes IX. and X. the Epistles to the Corinthians, with passages from Proverbs and the Prophets. All the classes are taught the history of Israel. But with all our well-prepared syllabuses we must take jealous care that Bible teaching does not lose its place and that it is not slovenly given. The responsibility rests not merely with the teacher but with the School Board and the people. Wild statements are sometimes made regarding the deficiency of religious instruction. In a Diocesan Council recently held it was stated that the greater part of children were growing up without a knowledge of God or their Saviour. That is exaggeration if not culpable ignorance. I can say this, that in all the schools under the Govan Parish School Board instruction in Bible and Catechism is, on the whole, faithfully and earnestly given. And what is true of this Board is true of most of the other Boards in Scotland. I have no fear that in the land of John Knox, to whose genius and earnestness we owe much

of our educational position, a direct and purposed education will ever cease to be provided—an education which has regard not merely to the bodies and minds of the children but also to their hearts and souls—an education which aims at stirring up the high hopes of being good men and worthy patriots—an education which is never weary of reiterating the grand words of the Old Catechism, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever."

Discussion.

Rev. Andrew Laidlaw, Glasgow, said he was afraid that none of them were perfectly satisfied with the state of religious education in Scotland. They felt it would be better if there was a higher religious tone among teachers, and also that the teaching of religion, instead of being relegated to a certain hour, should be part and parcel of the whole day's teaching. Their duty at present, however, was to do the best they could in the circumstances in which they found themselves in Scotland. After an experience of School Board work for nine years he had come to the conclusion that the great majority of the parents in Glasgow wished their children to receive religious instruction, as only five per cent. claimed exemption under the conscience clause. Strong statements had been made as to the secularism of the Scottish High Schools. An ounce of fact was worth a great deal of theory, and he showed that so far as Glasgow was concerned, religious instruction was given systematically in the High Schools of the Board. He hoped the day would come when they would get the Bible taught in these schools in the same way as the history of Rome or Greece is taught.

Rev. W. Brownlie, Lenzie, said that if there was not as yet a great deal of secularism in education, we were in danger of it. There were two lines of action open to the Church. . . . They would have good schools if they had good teachers, and they could not have good teachers unless

they had religious men and women. The Church of Scotland had no power over the teachers except through training colleges, and he saw with great regret the proposal constantly made to abolish the training colleges, partly owing to the expenditure and partly because the religion of the land had gone in directions and channels that made these training colleges in the old form something of a superfluity. It would be an evil day when the Church gave up her hold over these colleges. Then, in the next place they must see to the efficient organisation of the Sunday schools. In many schools there was a want of discipline and a very loose way of teaching. If the Church of Scotland was true to itself and true to its traditions she would see that her Sunday schools were as well organised as possible.

Rev. ROBERT THOMSON said there was not a Protestant school in the Parish of Dunfermline, and as a result Romanists had the ascendency, 120 Protestant children having to attend the Roman Catholic school. He did not see why Roman Catholics should be permitted to teach their doctrine and Protestants were not permitted to teach pure religion in the schools.

Rev. JOHN ANDERSON, Kelvinside, said there was one point that had been neglected in the discussion. He thought that at present the young had more than their share of attention. They had morning meetings, Boys' Brigades, and Sunday schools—in fact the whole missionary arrangements of the district were turned on them. Lads of sixteen or seventeen who loiter about our streets on Sunday would tell you, if you spoke to them, that they had attended the Boys' Brigade and Sunday school. Now they never darkened a church door. Parents were far too ready to hand over their children to Sunday school teachers and to morning meetings in order to be relieved of their responsibilities. These children in course of time got beyond age to attend these meetings and ceased to frequent any place of worship. The duty of members was to see that their

children went with them to church. In his congregation he could scarcely point to an unbroken family where the children all went to church with their parents on the Lord's Day. The best training a child could have was to be taught to go Sunday after Sunday to the house of God with its parents. It was a dull child that would not take something home even from the worst sermon.

Rev. Dr RUSSELL, Dunoon, said that in the Highlands all the teachers were English-speaking, and as the children could not understand English, the Bible was not known to the rising generation in the Islands and a large part of the Highlands of Scotland. He thought it important that School Boards should provide Gaelic-speaking teachers, so that the children might receive religious instruction in their own language.

CONCLUSION.

The MODERATOR said: The proceedings must now be drawn to a close. Before we part it is right that I, as occupying this chair, should give expression to your sentiments as well as my own regarding the great ability and high tone of the papers and addresses we have heard. I find that upwards of fifty have taken part in reading papers and making speeches, and I cannot recall a single word I would wish unsaid of all that has been brought before us. We all feel that this Congress has more than borne out the anticipation of its promoters. It is an admirable token that if these Congresses could be held all over Scotland we could scarcely over-estimate the service that would be rendered by them. Before we part, I think it is right that we gratefully recognise the services rendered by the Committees, and especially by the Secretaries, of the Congress. During the last six months they have done an enormous amount of work. The arrangements have been excellently planned and admirably carried out, and in your name I most cordially thank them.

Principal STORY.—I may be allowed to make a suggestion which I am sure will be welcome to all. The Moderator has spoken of the debt we owe to the Secretaries and those engaged in conducting the business of the Congress and the immense amount of preliminary business that has led up to it. We are very much indebted to them, and the great success of the Congress is, I am sure, their best reward. But there is another vote of thanks I think we should pay, and that is to the Moderator himself, who inaugurated the Congress by presiding over the service in the Cathedral and preaching a sermon most appropriate to the occasion, and who, throughout his occupation of the chair, has shown—as was not at all surprising to us who have known him as Moderator of the General Assembly—so much tact, skill and ability in conducting the various meetings. A great deal of the success and pleasantness with which the meetings have passed has been owing to him, and therefore I ask you to accord him a very hearty vote of thanks.

Psalm 122, verses 6-9 ("Pray that Jerusalem") was then sung, to the tune of St Paul's, after which the Moderator pronounced the benediction.

[The Mass Meeting, which was arranged to be held in the evening, and at which the subject was to have been "Home Missions and Church Extension," was postponed owing to the urgent public engagements of the chairman, the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P.]

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
022440

TURNBULL AND SPEARS, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

BONUS YEAR, 1900.

NORTH BRITISH & MERCANTILE
INSURANCE COMPANY.
ESTABLISHED 1809.

Incorporated by Royal Charter and Special Acts of Parliament.

FIRE. LIFE. ANNUITIES.

TOTAL ASSETS 1898 nearly - - - £14,000,000
TOTAL REVENUE 1898 over - - - £2,950,000

The Funds of the Life Department are not liable for Obligations under the Fire Department, nor are the Funds of the Fire Department liable for Obligations under the Life Department. In this Company, therefore, the Investments for the Life Department are kept entirely separate from those for the Fire Department, as set forth in the Balance-Sheet.

EDINBURGH BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

David B. Wauchope, Esq.
George Auldjo Jamieson, Esq.
Ralph Dundas, Esq.
John Wharton Tod, Fsq.
Sir James H. Gibson-Craig, Bart.
Sir Thomas Clark, Bart.

Sir Charles B. Logan, D.K.S.
Charles C. Maconochie, Esq.
Capt. Robert Dundas, yr. of Arniston.
John S. Pitman, Esq.
George Younger, Esq.
The Right Hon. The Earl of Elgin, K.G.

Manager—Philip R. D. Maclagan, F.R.S.E.
Secretary—H. J. Stevenson, W.S.
Actuary—Thomas Wallace, F.I.A., F.F.A.

Medical Officer—J. Playfair, M.D., F.R.C.P.E.
Solicitors—Dundas & Wilson, C.S.
Auditor—James Haldane, C.A.

LIFE BRANCH.—IMPORTANT FEATURES.

All Bonuses Vest on Declaration.

Nine-tenths of the Whole Profits of the Life Assurance Branch are allocated to Participating Policies.

CLAIMS PAID ON PROOF OF DEATH AND TITLE.

In addition to the ordinary schemes of Life Assurance, special attention is invited to the Company's

THREEFOLD OPTION SCHEME—
By which the Policyholder secures for himself
A Cash Payment at a Stated Age, or
An Annuity for Life and a Cash Payment at Death, or
A larger Annuity for Life.

FAMILY SETTLEMENT SCHEME—
By which a 5 per cent. investment is secured during life of widow—capital remaining unimpaired.

ENDOWMENT ASSURANCE SCHEME—
Sum payable to Assured on attainment of a given age, or to his representatives or assignees at death, if that happens earlier than the specified age.

ANNUITY BRANCH.

Annuities, Immediate, Contingent, or Deferred, are granted on favourable terms.

FIRE DEPARTMENT.

Net Fire Premiums for 1898 - - £1,424,258.

Property of nearly every description insured at Home or Abroad at the lowest rates of Premium corresponding to the risk.

Losses Promptly and Liberally settled.

Prospectuses may be had at the Chief Offices, Branches, or Agencies.

CHIEF OFFICES:

EDINBURGH: 64 PRINCES ST. | LONDON: 61 THREADNEEDLE ST., E.C.

THE HYMN COMMITTEE'S PUBLICATIONS

Published by Messrs BLACKWOOD & SONS, Edinburgh.

The Scottish Hymnal.

PICA TYPE, for aged Persons and Pulpit use, Cloth, Red Edges 2s. 6d.
BOURGEOIS TYPE, Limp Cloth, Red Edges . . . 1s. 0d.
NONPAREIL TYPE, Limp Cloth, Red Edges . . . 6d.

Sunday School Edition of the Scottish Hymnal.

THE SCOTTISH HYMNAL, complete, Red Paper . . 1d.

Published by Messrs T. NELSON & SONS, Edinburgh and London.

The Scottish Hymnal, with Tunes. 485 Tunes.

OLD NOTATION, Crown 8vo, Cloth, Red Edges . . 3s. 6d.
SOL-FA NOTATION, Post 8vo, Cloth, Red Edges . . 2s. 6d.
OLD NOTATION, Post 8vo, *Small Type Edition*, Cloth, Red Edges 1s. 6d.
SOL-FA NOTATION, Post 8vo, *Small Type Edition*, Cloth, Red Edges . . . . . 1s. 6d.

The Complete Scottish Hymnal, with Two part Music, for Sunday Schools.

O. N. or S. F. TREBLE AND ALTO PARTS. Paper, 4d; Cloth 6d.

The Psalms and Paraphrases, with Revised Music. 225 Tunes.

OLD NOTATION, Crown 8vo, Cut-leaved, Cloth, Red Edges . 2s. 6d.
SOL-FA NOTATION, Post 8vo, Cut-leaved, Cloth, Red Edges . 2s. 0d.

The Psalms, Paraphrases, and Scottish Hymnal, in One Volume. 710 Tunes.

OLD NOTATION, Crown 8vo, Cloth, Red Edges . . 5s. 6d.
SOL-FA NOTATION, Post 8vo, Cloth, Red Edges . . 4s. 6d.

The Scottish Prose Psalter, with Music and Revised pointing (1897). 415 Chants.

OLD NOTATION, Crown 8vo, Cut-leaved, Cloth, Red Edges . 3s. 0d.
SOL-FA NOTATION, Post 8vo, Cut-leaved, Cloth, Red Edges . 2s. 6d.

NOTE.—The former edition of the Psalter with music can still be had—prices as above.

The Scottish Psalter (Words Only), pointed for Chanting, Cloth, Red Edges . . . . 1s. 0d.
Do. do. Cheap Edition, Cloth limp . . . 8d.
Do. do. AND SCOTTISH HYMNAL, in One Volume, Cloth, Red Edges . . . . . 2s. 0d.

The Psalms, Paraphrases, and Scottish Psalter, in One Volume. 640 Tunes.

OLD NOTATION, Crown 8vo, Cut-leaved, Cloth, Red Edges . 5s. 6d.
SOL-FA NOTATION, Post 8vo, Cut-leaved, Cloth, Red Edges . 4s. 6d.

The Scottish Anthem Book.

OLD NOTATION. Crown 8vo, Cloth, Red Edges . . 5s. 0d.
Do. do. Part I. Crown 8vo, Cloth, Red Edges . 2s. 6d.
SOL-FA NOTATION. Post 8vo, Cloth, Red Edges . . 3s. 6d.
Do. do. Part I. do. do. . . 2s. 0d.

The Scottish Anthem Book. Words only. Cloth limp 7d.

TO BE HAD OF

J. GARDNER HITT, 37 George Street, Edinburgh,

And all Booksellers.

Scottish Metropolitan

Life Assurance Company, Limited.

LOW PREMIUMS.
LIBERAL CONDITIONS.
ABSOLUTE SECURITY.

COMBINED LIFE AND ACCIDENT POLICIES

At Premiums usually charged for Life Assurance only.

ACME (TRIPLE BENEFIT) ACCIDENT & ANNUITY POLICY

INSURING AGAINST

DEATH, DISEASE, AND DISABLEMENT,

INCLUDING UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

AN ANNUITY FOR LIFE.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ASSURANCE

IN ALL ITS BRANCHES.

HEAD OFFICE—

25 ST ANDREW SQUARE, EDINBURGH.

LONDON OFFICE—8 KING STREET, CHEAPSIDE, E.C.
GLASGOW OFFICE—107 WELLINGTON STREET.
ABERDEEN OFFICE—177 UNION STREET.

APPLICATIONS FOR AGENCIES INVITED.

PATTERN III.s.

TESTIMONIALS

from

Sir JOHN STAINER,
M.A., D.C.L.,
Mus.Doc.;

Sir GEO. MARTIN,
Mus.Doc.,
Organist of St Paul's
Cathedral;

Prof. E. H. TURPIN,
Hon. Sec.,
Royal College of
Organists;

&c., &c.

THE NEW "POSITIVE" PIPE ORGAN

(CASSON'S PATENT).

Pedal and two manual effects combined in one keyboard.

As Shown at the General Assemblies, May 1899, and at Church Congress, Glasgow, October 1899.

Price from £75 to £200.

Catalogue and Full Particulars Post Free from

JAMES GRAHAM & CO.,
22 SHANDWICK PLACE, EDINBURGH,
and FALKIRK,

Sole Agents for South-East of Scotland.

P. Larg & Co., Aberdeen, *General Sole Agents.* or **Ewing & M'Intosh, Glasgow,** *Sole Agents for West of Scotland.*

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND PUBLICATIONS.

HISTORICAL PHILOSOPHY IN FRANCE AND FRENCH BELGIUM AND SWITZERLAND. By Professor FLINT, Edinburgh. 8vo, 21s.

THEISM. Being the Baird Lecture for 1876. By the same Author. Ninth Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

ANTI-THEISTIC THEORIES. Being the Baird Lecture for 1877. By the same Author. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES. By the same Author. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE POETRY AND THE RELIGION OF THE PSALMS. The Croall Lectures, 1893-94. By Prof. ROBERTSON, D.D., Glasgow University. Demy 8vo, 12s.

THE EARLY RELIGION OF ISRAEL. As set forth by Biblical Writers and Modern Critical Historians. Being the Baird Lecture for 1888-89. By the same Author. Fourth Edition, Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

RECENT ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE BIBLE. Being the Croall Lectures for 1898. By the Rev. Prof. NICOL, D.D., Aberdeen University. Demy 8vo, 9s. net.

THE PRESENT POSITION AND PROSPECTS OF BIBLICAL SCIENCE. Being the Introductory Lecture delivered at the Opening of the Divinity Session in the University of Aberdeen By the same Author. Price 6d.

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION. Its Epochs, Episodes, Leaders, and DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS. (Being the Baird Lecture for 1899). By the late ALEXANDER F. MITCHELL, D.D., Emeritus Professor of Church History in St Andrews University. Edited by D. HAY FLEMING. With a Memoir. Crown 8vo, 6s

JOHN WESLEY AND GEORGE WHITEFIELD IN SCOTLAND; or, The INFLUENCE OF THE OXFORD METHODISTS ON SCOTTISH RELIGION. By the Rev. D. BUTLER, M.A., Minister of Abernethy. Crown 8vo. 5s.

HENRY SCOUGAL AND THE OXFORD METHODISTS; or, The In-FLUENCE OF A RELIGIOUS TEACHER OF THE SCOTTISH CHURCH. By the same Author. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

A DIGEST OF LAWS AND DECISIONS, ECCLESIASTICAL AND CIVIL, RELATING TO THE CONSTITUTION, PRACTICE, AND AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. With Notes and Forms of Procedure. By the Rev. WILLIAM MAIR, D.D., Earlston. New Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo, 9s. net.

SPEAKING; or, From Voice Production to the Platform and Pulpit. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. *[Immediately.*

OLD CREEDS AND NEW BELIEFS. By the Rev. W. H. GRAY, D.D., Edinburgh. Crown 8vo, 5s.

BALMERINO AND ITS ABBEY. A Parish History, With Notices of the Adjacent District. By the Rev. JAMES CAMPBELL, D.D., F.S.A.Scot., Balmerino. A New Edition. With an Appendix of Illustrative Documents, a Map of the Parish, and upwards of 40 Illustrations. Demy 8vo, 30s. net.

KYRIE ELEISON ("Lord, have Mercy"). A Manual of Private Prayers. With Notes and Additional Matter. By the Rev. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A. Cloth, red edges, 1s. net; limp leather, 1s. 6d. net.

THE EDINBURGH GIFFORD LECTURES.

PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM. (Lecture 1894-96.) By Professor CAMPBELL FRASER. Second Edition, Revised. Post 8vo, 6s. 6d. net.

ELEMENTS OF THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION. (Lecture 1896-98.) By Professor C. P. TIELE. 2 vols. post 8vo, 15s. net.

PHILOSOPHY AND DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION. (Lecture 1894.) By Professor OTTO PFLEIDERER, D.D. 2 vols. post 8vo, 15s. net.

WM. BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

Pulpit Robe Establishment

MACDONALD, MIDDLEMASS & WOOD

These Robes are famed
for their
Elegance and Superior
Qualities.

PRIZE MEDAL
FOR PULPIT ROBES.

International Exhibition,
Edinburgh, 1886.

In Fit, Style, and Value
they are unsurpassed.

Patterns of SILKS with Price List, or Box of ROBES, sent on approbation to any part of the Country, Carriage Free.

Clerical Frock Coat Suits, . .	from 90/ to 130/
Clerical Tweed Suits, . . .	„ 70/ „ 90/
Clerical Winter Overcoats, . .	„ 45/ „ 90/
Clerical Summer Overcoats, . .	„ 21/ „ 70/
Clerical Soft Felt Hats, . . .	„ 7/6 and 8/6
Clerical Collars (with fronts), . .	„ 1/ each.

MACDONALD, MIDDLEMASS & WOOD,

Clerical Clothiers and Pulpit Robe Makers,

29A & 31 SOUTH HANOVER STREET, EDINBURGH.

D-8588 ~SB
5-11
CC

THE

Scottish Provident Institution

ESTABD. 1837 — INCORPD. 1848

IN THIS SOCIETY are combined the advantages of

Mutual Assurance with **Moderate Premiums.**

THE PREMIUMS are so moderate that, at usual ages for Assurance, £1200 or £1250 may generally be secured from the first for the yearly payment which would elsewhere assure (with Profits) £1000 only—the difference being equivalent to an immediate and certain Bonus of 20 to 25 per cent.

THE WHOLE SURPLUS goes to the Policyholders on a system at once safe and equitable—no share being given to those by whose early death there is a *loss* to the common fund.

Examples of Premiums for £100 at Death—With Profits.

Age.	25	30*	35†	40	45	50
During Life .	£1 18 0	£2 6	£2 6 10	£2 14 9	£3 5 9	£4 1 7
25 Payments .	2 10 2	2 13 0	2 17 9	3 4 6	3 14 0	4 8 7
15 Payments .	3 8 5	3 12 1	3 18 0	4 5 8	4 16 2	5 11 8

* A PERSON of 30 may secure £1000 at death, by a yearly payment, *during life*, of £20, 15s., which would in most Offices secure (with profits) £800 only; or he may secure £1000 by 25 payments of £26, 10s., *being thus free of payment before age* 55.

† AT AGE 35, the Premium *ceasing before age* 60 is, for £1000, £28, 17s. 6d., being about the same as many Offices require during the whole of life. TO PROFESSIONAL MEN and others whose income is dependent on health, the limited payment system is recommended.

THE SURPLUS at last Investigation was £1,423,000.

More than one-half of the Members who died during the septennial period were entitled to **Bonuses** which, **notwithstanding that the Premiums do not as a rule exceed the non-profit rates of other Offices**, were on the average equal to **an addition of about 50 per cent.** to the Policies which participated.

The ACCUMULATED FUNDS exceed £11,000,000.

PROSPECTUS, WITH TABLES OF RATES, ON APPLICATION.

LONDON OFFICE, 17 King William Street, E.C. GLASGOW, 29 St Vincent Place.
DUNDEE, 49 Meadowside. ABERDEEN, 166 Union Street.

HEAD OFFICE: No. 6 ST. ANDREW SQUARE, EDINBURGH.

X
075
5
899

Church of Scotland.
First church congress, held by order of the General Assembly, Glasgow, October 25th to 27th 1899; official report of proceedings. Edinburgh, J. Gardner Hitt, 1899.
vii, 200p. 23cm.

At head of title: Church of Scotland.

1. Church of Scotland--Congresses. I. Title. II. Church of Scotland. General Assembly.

CCSC/mmb

022440